DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 350 382 CE 060 810

AUTHOR	Sibbison, Virginia Hayes
TITLE	The Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge Grants Program 1987-1990. Assessment Report.
INSTITUTION	Welfare Research, Inc., Albany, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY	Freedom Forum, Reston, VA.
PUB DATE	92
NOTE	170p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Welfare Research, Inc. (WRI), 112 State Street, Albany, NY 12207 ($15.99).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC07 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Adult Basic Education; *Adult Literacy; *Adult Programs; Cooperative Programs; Coordination; *Educational Innovation; Grants; Illiteracy; *Literacy Education; Nonprofit Organizations; Private Sector; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; State Government; State Programs; *Statewide Planning; Success
IDENTIFIERS	*Gannett Foundation

ABSTRACT

This report describes how 20 states and Puerto Rico used $2.7 million awarded by the Gannett Foundation to build and expand adult literacy activities in a coordinated fashion statewide. Chapter 1 presents information on development of the Literacy Challenge grants program and brief descriptions of each project, including year funded, amount of awarded funds, and sponsoring agency. Chapter 2 provides an overview of the diversity, range, and magnitude of projects' efforts. Activities are generally grouped under information and referral, recruitment and training, resource and system expansion, evaluations, and unique project components. Chapter 3 discusses some complex and interesting aspects of the initiative, with specific attention to influencing variables: diversity of aspirations and achievements among the projects; real and perceived barriers; influence of unique individuals; difficulties encountered in fundraising; and issues associated with the cooperative/collaborative process. Environments within which the projects operated are discussed. Chapter 4 groups the projects into three major categories: likely, uncertain, or unlikely survival. Chapter 5 contains recommendations to the foundation regarding grant procedures, technical assistance, and monitoring. Appendixes include a list of goals and objectives of all projects and a list of all of the projects' activities and products. An attached products list presents products in alphabetical order by state. Products are classified according to their primary function in the state. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED350382

The Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge Grants Program 1987-1990

ASSESSMENT REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

● Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R McBride

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE060810

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge Grants Program 1987-1990

ASSESSMENT REPORT

Submitted to The Freedom Forum by:
Welfare Research, Inc. (WRI)
112 State Street
Albany, New York 12207

Virginia Hayes Sibbison, Ph.D.
Executive Director

December 1991

© 1992 by WRI. All rights reserved.

The Freedom Forum is the new name of the Gannett Foundation.

THE FREEDOM FORUM
FREE PRESS FREE SPEECH FREE SPIRIT

Prefatory Note

The Freedom Forum is pleased that the Literacy Challenge, which we initiated as the Gannett Foundation, has now been fully and expertly documented and evaluated in this independent assessment report.

The report clearly examines how this ambitious program was implemented, its goals, its activities, and its results.

As the nation's largest media-related foundation, devoted to fostering free press, free speech, and free spirit, The Freedom Forum remains committed to the ideal of a literate, informed public as the platform for democracy.

We hope that the record of the Literacy Challenge as set forth in this report will help adult literacy agencies and other organizations provide more effective services throughout the USA.

Charles Overby

Charles L. Overby
President and CEO
The Freedom Forum

The Gannett Foundation's Literacy Challenge

In 1986, the Gannett Foundation, along with USA TODAY, initiated the Literacy Challenge grants program. The goals of the program were to establish lasting mechanisms for providing literacy services, to develop innovative state-level projects to permanently expand adult literacy services, and to make adult literacy services and resources permanently available in all parts of a state. Over the course of three years (1987-1990), awards totaling nearly $2.7 million were granted to projects in 21 states.

In late 1989, the Gannett Foundation contracted with Welfare Research, Inc. (WRI), a nonprofit research organization based in Albany, New York, to document the activities, impacts, and outcomes of the Literacy Challenge grant program. Three products resulted from this contract: a compilation of 21 Individual Project Reports, a state-by-state Products List, and this Assessment Report assessing the program as a whole and in detail. These publications are available from WRI, 112 State Street, Albany, NY 12207.

The Freedom Forum is the new name of the Gannett Foundation.

Contents

Prefatory Note .... *ii*

Acknowledgments .... *v*

Foreword .... *vii*

Executive Summary xi

Chapter One
Development of the Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge Grants Program 1
- A. Year 1 Awards 3
- B. Year 2 Awards 7
- C. Bonus Awards 10
- D. Summaries of Individual Project Characteristics 12

Chapter Two
Significant Activities 15
- A. Information and Referral 16
- B. Recruitment and Training 24
- C. Resource and System Expansion 33
- D. Evaluations 48
- E. Unique Project Components 53

Chapter Three
Discussion 73
- A. The Process 73
- B. Influencing Variables 75
- C. Operating Environments 81

Chapter Four
Outcomes of the Coalitions 103
- A. Coalition Survival: Likely 103
- B. Coalition Survival: Uncertain 106
- C. Coalition Survival: Unlikely 108

Chapter Five
Recommendations 113

Appendices

Appendix A: Project Goals and Objectives 115
Appendix B. Reported Activities and Results 131

Tables

Table 1: Estimated Number or Percentage of Functional Illiterates 12
Table 2: Challenge Grant Funds Received 13
Table 3: Sponsoring Agency 14
Table 4: Significant Activities 17

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank The Freedom Forum (formerly the Gannett Foundation) for its support of this initiative. The decision to undertake an assessment of the Literacy Challenge grants program was a thoughtful and somewhat unusual one in that the funds had already been spent. It was insightful to recognize that retrospective lessons could be learned from both the successes and the failures of the projects. Special appreciation is extended to Christy C. Bulkeley, Freedom Forum Vice President, whose commitment to adult literacy issues, and to this project in particular, has been unwavering. The dedication of her time and energy to reviewing drafts of the 21 Individual Project Reports as well as this Assessment Report was crucial to the conduct of our work.

We would also like to thank the project managers and associated board members of the 21 projects who graciously extended their cooperation during our site visits and numerous telephone conversations. One of the most enjoyable aspects of our work was the opportunity to meet this group of dedicated, unfailingly optimistic professionals.

Finally, the author wishes to acknowledge the invaluable contributions of four WRI staff members in the development and production of this report: Guy Farrell, Associate Director, who conducted eight site visits and provided comments on the projects; Rebecca McBride, Senior Writer/Editor, to whom fell the monumental task of editing all 21 Individual Project Reports as well as this report; Stephanie Richardson, Production Manager, who provided design and production assistance; and Michelle Burris, Executive Secretary.

Virginia Hayes Sibbison
Executive Director, Welfare Research, Inc.
Project Director, Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge Project

Foreword

In the summer of 1986, the Gannett Foundation (now known as The Freedom Forum) and USA TODAY challenged state literacy and government leaders to collaborate to expand literacy services in their states. The Foundation offered $1 million in grants up to $100,000 for the first year's activities.

The Literacy Challenge eventually grew to nearly $2.7 million in grants and involved 20 states plus Puerto Rico. Grant support by state varied from one year to three years. This report covers what happened—and what didn't happen—with those funded projects. It also offers an analysis to help guide future collaborative efforts, not only among literacy providers, but among any human service providers working at the state level with local service delivery.

Some background is in order.

The Literacy Challenge grew out of a conversation in the summer of 1986 between Charles L. Overby, then a news executive with Gannett Co., Inc., and Eugene C. Dorsey, then president of the Gannett Foundation. Overby, now president and CEO of The Freedom Forum, wondered about the possibility of a national literacy campaign involving USA TODAY, building on the Foundation's 18-month-old special adult literacy project.

Growth in the value of Gannett Co., Inc. stock, the Foundation's primary asset, led Dorsey to believe the Foundation could comfortably commit up to $2 million over two years to such an effort. The Foundation staff already had developed hypothetical models for projects with USA TODAY that would avoid confusion with the Foundation's charitable grants program in the local communities served by local properties of Gannett Co., Inc..

Tom Curley, a journalist and the president of USA TODAY, made the call to focus on the states. Betty Sullivan, then of USA TODAY's educational service department, worked with Foundation staff to develop plans and guidelines. (Joan Baraloto succeeded Sullivan for the second and subsequent years.)

The Literacy Challenge, a competitive $2 million state-level grant program, was announced on September 11 at a national press conference in Washington, D.C. The deadline for proposals was December 31, 1986.

The guidelines were relatively simple, in keeping with "local autonomy" news principles of Gannett Co., Inc. and the Foundation's operating principle that people who deliver human services are the best equipped to define the problems and priorities to be addressed.

The critical element was the required sign-off from the applicant state's governor, the chief educational executive or director of adult education, the chief executive of the library system, the state-level literacy organizations, and any other organizations whose participation was anticipated in the proposal. That requirement served two purposes:

- First, it put everyone on notice of the Foundation's and USA TODAY's expectations for the minimum participation required in a successful partnership to achieve literacy system expansion.
- Second, it headed off the possibility of multiple applications from lesser partnerships, thus keeping the application load manageable for staff of the Foundation and USA TODAY, neither of which had a full-time literacy expert.

The other critical component was the National Advisory Board. Participants were invited from all levels—city, state and national—and from government and the nonprofit and private sectors. Invitations were sent late during the proposal development window. The first meeting was in January 1987, after the proposal deadline, to avoid any appearance of conflict of interest.

Board members were asked to help "think through" the issues and processes--not to help judge individual proposals or to select from among finalists.

The 75 applications came from 48 states and 3 territories. Among the "extras" were applications from individual city organizations hoping to expand, from competing halves of state-level leadership, and from individual state organizations, in effect signaling us of their exclusion from but interest in the collaborative projects submitted by another group within their state.

The 13 winning proposals—12 states and Puerto Rico—were announced on February 26, 1987, with grants totaling $1.25 million. The expansion resulted from the quality and promise of the competing applications.

The advisory board strongly recommended that the Foundation provide a combination of project manager meetings and site visits to accomplish technical assistance the projects would probably need to overcome hurdles, adapt to changes, and so forth. Neither activity had been part of the original plan. Eventually, three meetings of project managers were held, and a few half-day site visits were made.

Projects were advised in mid-summer that renewal funding equal to 50 percent of the first year's grant-funded operating costs would be made for the second year, assuming sufficient progress was made by year-end. The other $500,000 available in the second year would fund a second round of competitive grants. Projects from states not funded in the first round would be eligible for consideration.

The second competitive round produced 45 applications from 36 states (all but 2 eligible), 2 territories, and the District of Columbia. Within the mix were some from states reflecting significant progress--progress motivated, in part they said, by a commitment to show their ability to move forward even without the outside funding, and others demonstrating improvement based on lessons from the first year's winners.

On February 16, 1988, 9 new grants and 12 renewals, totaling $1.35 million, were announced. One of the original grants of $100,000 was rescinded for lack of action. That permitted the addition of the ninth project for the 1988-89 grant year.

All 21 funded projects were eligible for bonus grants in a third year, which was added to the Literacy Challenge funding. A total of $250,000 was available. The original projects were invited to propose ways to share and replicate elsewhere what they had accomplished. Those funded initially in the second year were invited to propose ways they would use a bonus grant to carry on, if available. Four bonus proposals were funded, totaling $160,000, for the 1989-90 grant year.

Project reports related to individual projects' schedules and installment payments of the grants. The projects never were locked into a uniform reporting format or timetable. That obviously compounded the challenge to the Foundation and USA TODAY of reporting what was being accomplished and what was being learned.

In the spring of 1989, Welfare Research, Inc. (WRI), a nonprofit evaluation and management consulting organization dealing with human services at the multiple levels of government, was commissioned to review and report on the individual projects. The initial contract covered those committed to establishing a general coalition for statewide activities. The second phase, commissioned early in 1990, related to the projects with special initiatives.

Because working collaboratively at the state level is relatively new to public-private partnerships, WRI was asked to pay particular attention to what didn't work and what was learned from each project as well as to report the accomplishments. In asking the projects for their complete and candid cooperation, we reminded the state project leaders that they were engaged in cutting-edge activities. Thus, "there can be no right or wrong or failure—unless we fail to learn all of the lessons each project has to offer." This report, and the 21 individual project reports, are the result.

This report includes a detailed description of all of the projects. Each description covers the situation at the time of the winning application and what happened during execution of the grants.

Readers should remember that the years involved—September 1986 through the summer of 1990—included major parallel development. Among them:

- Project Literacy U.S. (PLUS), the unprecedented partnership of the Public Broadcasting Service and Capital Cities/ABC to focus attention on literacy
- The presidential campaign and resulting national platform for federal leadership; the also unprecedented partnership between the Working Group of Adult Literacy Providers and the Southport Institute for Policy Analysis, initiated by Harold McGraw, the retired chairman of McGraw Hill, through the Business Council for Effective Literacy
- The "Amnesty Act," greatly increasing demand for English as a Second Language instruction primarily in 10 states
- Federal legislation requiring literacy services for welfare recipients by 1990 and providing some funding for services to the homeless

All of these activities—and gubernatorial elections along the way—created a far more complex playing field than anticipated when the Literacy Challenge started. Those circumstances should be kept in mind as readers seek ideas and lessons to help in their own work.

The overall analysis by Virginia Hayes Sibbison, Ph.D., Executive Director of WRI, who served as hands-on project leader and made 13 site visits herself, assisted that learning process.

The contract with WRI also yielded a project-by-project list of products developed with Gannett Foundation grant money and available to others in the field.

In addition to the project managers and their state leaders, participants in the Literacy Challenge Advisory Board meetings were immensely helpful to the overall success of the project. They were:

Dr. Ira Aaron, International Reading Association
Judith Butler-McPhie, National Urban League
Jim Duffy, Anderson Clark, Jack Harr and Cindy VandenHeuvel, Cap Cities/ABC
Dr. Grady C. Jordan, high school district superintendent, Chicago
Jinx Crouch, Literacy Volunteers of America
Bruce Christensen and Dee Brock, Public Broadcasting Service
Jean Hammink, The Literacy Network
Karl Haigler, U.S. Department of Education
Judith A. Koloski, American Association for Adult and Continuing Education
Marcienne S. Mattleman, Philadelphia Mayor's Commission on Literacy
Frank Newman, Education Commission of the States
Lori Orum, National Council of LaRaza
Dr. Fred Romero, SER-Research and Policy Institute
Roger Semerad and Lloyd Feldman, U.S. Department of Labor
Daniel Walsh and Penny L. Ellis, Business Council of New York State
Jim Souby, Council of State Policy and Planning Agencies
Gail Spangenberg, Business Council for Effective Literacy
W.M. Speights, IBM Corporation
Peter Waite, Laubach Literacy Action

Christy C. Bulkeley

Christy C. Bulkeley
Vice President, The Freedom Forum

Executive Summary

The Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge

In 1986, the Gannett Foundation, long a leader in foundation funding for adult literacy initiatives, developed a cooperative venture with USA TODAY entitled the "Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge" grants program. This was the first large-scale, nongovernment funding targeted to the expansion of statewide adult literacy systems, the enhancement of state-level literacy leadership, and the infusion of large numbers of new adult literacy trainers, tutors, and students into those systems. It also reflected the Gannett Foundation leadership's recognition of "...the growing importance of state governments and associations of nonprofit organizations and private businesses in alerting their members to local needs and ways to meet them and in building public awareness of literacy issues" (Eugene C. Dorsey, Gannett Foundation President, 8/14/86).

A Request for Proposals (RFP) was issued in September 1986, announcing the two-year, $2 million state-level grants program. The goals of the program, as clearly stated in the RFP, were: (1) to strengthen statewide adult literacy efforts through coordination of agencies; (2) to teach more adults to read by involving more volunteers as tutors; (3) to increase the resources available to literacy agencies; and (4) to generate greater public awareness of the problem of adult literacy and how individuals, groups, and communities can help.

On February 26, 1987, the Gannett Foundation announced Year 1 awards to 12 states and Puerto Rico, totaling more than $1.25 million. The winners were chosen from among 75 proposals from 48 states, the District of Columbia, and two U.S. territories. Proposals came from a wide variety of sources, involving governors' offices, volunteer literacy organizations, state education and library departments, public housing tenants' associations, labor unions, businesses, and public and private universities. Winning proposals came from Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas, and the state of Washington.

Applications for the "second and final" Literacy Challenge grants program were due by December 31, 1987. The Year 2 RFP indicated that the Gannett Foundation, originally committed to a $2 million program, had increased its total commitment to $2.2 million. The Foundation was providing the remaining $1 million in the second year, of which $500,000 was earmarked for new grants and the remainder for renewals of existing grants. The basic goals of the Literacy Challenge grants program remained essentially the same as those indicated in the Year 1 application, as did the criteria for eligible organizations and for appropriate activities.

On February 16, 1988 the Gannett Foundation announced the 21 recipients (chosen from 45 applicants) of the second round of the Literacy Challenge grants program, yet again expanding to a total of $1.35 million. Approximately $800,000 was allocated to 9 new projects, with approximately $525,000 for the renewals of 12 of the 13 original projects. These commitments rounded out the two-year, $2.5 million competitive grant program initiated in late 1986. New winning proposals came from Alabama, Alaska, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Kentucky, Mississippi, New Mexico, and New York.

In December 1988, the Gannett Foundation announced to the Literacy Challenge project managers that a limited number of renewal grants would be made in 1989. This funding extended the Foundation's initiative into a third year for a total commitment of nearly $2.7 million allocated over the three-year period. All 21 of the operating projects in the initial two years of the Literacy Challenge grants program were eligible to apply for the third year bonus funding; 17 did so.

On March 1, 1989, the Gannett Foundation announced the awarding of "Bonus Grants" to four projects. The grants, totaling approximately $160,000, were made to Alaska, Connecticut, Nevada, and New Mexico. For three of these projects, the Bonus Grants represented second year funding; for the fourth, Nevada, the Bonus Grant was third year funding.

In sum, the Literacy Challenge requirement for a coalition-based grant application resulted in a large number of projects (21), diverse in their planned efforts as well as their aspirations and expectations. Other results of the initiative were as follows: (1) 11 states and Puerto Rico were successful in obtaining funds for both years; (2) nine additional states were able to develop a successful proposal for the second year of funding; (3) four states were successful in obtaining "Bonus" grants; (4) of these four, three (New Mexico, Alaska, and Connecticut) had not received Year 1 grants (and hence, the Bonus grant was in essence a second year award), and for the fourth (Nevada), funded for both Years 1 and 2, the Bonus grant was in essence a third year grant; (5) 29 states submitted an application during one or both of the competitions but were never funded; (6) only one state (North Carolina) did not apply in either Year 1 or Year 2; and (7) only one state (Texas) received a grant which was subsequently rescinded.

Describing and Assessing the Literacy Challenge

This Assessment Report, its associated 21 Individual Project Reports, and the state-by-state Products List, are the result of the Gannett Foundation's decision in 1989 to contract with Welfare Research, Inc. (WRI), a nonprofit research organization, to document the activities, impacts, and outcomes of the Literacy Challenge grant program. As stated by Christy C. Bulkeley, Gannett Foundation Vice President, in correspondence to the project managers in August 1989: "The goal is not an evaluation in the 'what's good, what isn't good' sense, but rather reports that will describe factually what's happened and why. That will enable not only the Literacy Challenge projects but also others in the field to see what might work to improve or enhance their activities to expand literacy systems and involve more volunteers."

Methodology

It is important to note that much of the information in this Report, as well as that in the 21 Individual Project Reports, was provided by the Literacy Challenge grants project staff themselves in site visit interviews, correspondence, and/or various project materials such as reports, newsletters, and their submitted proposals. It was not the intention, nor was it within the resources, of this assessment to seek independent verification of figures or findings reported to the Gannett Foundation. If, however, discrepancies emerged during review of the materials or during the site visit, they were noted in the individual reports and are referenced here.

The first 11 states involved in the review and site-visit process were selected on the basis of the types of activities with which they were engaged. That is, these projects were more general state-level coalitions, engaged in some or all basic coalition functions (e.g., hotlines, newsletters, directories, conferences, etc.). Special focus projects, such as those located in Connecticut and Illinois, as well as those geographically distant (e.g., Alaska, California, Washington, and Oregon), were held in abeyance for the time being. The 11 states included Alabama, Delaware, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, New York, Pennsylvania, and Tennessee.

When contacted by the Gannett Foundation during August 1989, Literacy Challenge grant project managers were assured that the goal of the review and upcoming site visit was not an evaluation in the "what's good, what isn't good" sense, but rather was intended to generate reports factually describing what happened and why. "That will enable not only the Literacy Challenge projects but also others in the field to see what might work to improve or enhance their activities to expand literacy systems and involve more volunteers."

In January 1990, 10 more states were notified that WRI would be contacting them to schedule site visits as part of the comprehensive review being conducted on behalf of the Gannett Foundation. These states were Alaska, California, Connecticut, Illinois, Kentucky, Minnesota, Oregon, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, and Washington.

Assessment Report

The Assessment Report on the Literacy Challenge grants program is organized as follows:

- *Chapter One* presents information on the development of the Literacy Challenge grants program and brief descriptions of each of the projects, including year funded, the amount of awarded funds, and the sponsoring agency. Summarized information is included on the numbers and/or percentages of illiterates reported by each state (Table 1); the amount of Literacy Challenge funds received (Table 2); and the sponsoring fiscal agent for each of the projects (Table 3).
- *Chapter Two* provides a comprehensive overview of the diversity, range, and magnitude of the efforts undertaken by the projects. Summarized information is provided by state (Table 4). Activities are generally grouped under Information and Referral; Recruitment and Training; Resource and System Expansion; Evaluations; and Unique Project Components.
- *Chapter Three* presents a discussion of some of the more complex and interesting aspects of the overall initiative, with specific attention to influencing variables such as the diversity of aspirations and achievements among the projects; real and perceived barriers; the influence of unique individuals; difficulties encountered in fundraising; and issues associated with the cooperative/collaborative process. Also discussed are the environments within which the projects operated, with particular attention to the "politics" of being located within government or within a nonprofit organization; the overall awareness and receptivity of each state to adult literacy issues; and the roles of advisory groups and boards of directors.
- *Chapter Four* groups the projects into three major categories: those whose survival is likely; those whose survival is uncertain; and those whose survival is unlikely.
- *Chapter Five* contains five recommendations to the Gannett Foundation: to make longer term financial investments in grantees, even if that means making fewer grants; to specifically allocate a portion of grantee funds to fund development efforts, thereby increasing the likelihood that resource and fund development will be given adequate and appropriate attention; to provide grantees with more direct technical assistance, particularly in the marketing of their products and materials; to increase the use of site visits, both as a means of providing technical assistance and as a strategy for better monitoring the performance of grantees; and to determine early in the

grants process what type of impact information is desired, and to require its submission as an element of the grant itself.

- *Appendix A* contains a comprehensive list of the goals and objectives of all of the projects, and *Appendix B* contains a detailed list of all of the projects' activities and products. A review of these appendices will give the reader a comprehensive understanding of the diversity of the initiatives as well as the scope and range of the aspirations held by the projects' staff.

Copies of the 21 Individual Project Reports, additional copies of this Assessment Report, and copies of the Products List for all projects are available from WRI, 112 State Street, Albany, NY 12207. The Individual Project Reports describe in detail the goals, objectives, activities, and products of each initiative, as well as their successes and failures. The names and addresses of contact people in each state are included in the Individual Project Reports and in the Products List.

CHAPTER ONE

Development of the Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge Grants Program

Frank E. Gannett, founder of Gannett Company, Inc., created the Gannett Foundation in 1935. By 1985, when the Literacy Challenge grants initiative began, the Gannett Foundation (now known as the Freedom Forum) was (and remains) among the nation's 20 largest private foundations. With year-end assets of more than $570 million, it had spent more than $26 million on grants and programs in 1986. It was funding community projects in locations where Gannett Company, Inc. had subsidiaries, and it had two operating programs—the Gannett Center for Media Studies at Columbia University, the nation's first institute for the advanced study of mass communication and technological change, and the Paul Miller Washington Reporting Fellowships in Washington, D.C.—both national programs to improve journalism education and professionalism. It also offered scholarships and funded local programs to promote adult literacy, philanthropy, and volunteerism.

The Gannett Foundation was the leading nongovernmental funding source of adult literacy programs in the mid-1980s. Focusing early on the needs of adult learners in its 50th Anniversary Literacy Project in 1985, the Gannett Foundation made $614,000 in grants to assist community-based tutoring programs in areas served by Gannett Company, Inc. media, and to promote computers as literacy resources. In its follow-up 1986 Adult Literacy Project, another $800,000 was granted to grassroots programs and special literacy projects involving computers and video-based training kits for local literacy groups.

The decision in 1986 to expand these efforts to the state level was a "sea change," in that it shifted the Gannett Foundation's focus to a broader operating field. This new initiative, a cooperative venture between the Gannett Foundation and USA TODAY, was entitled the "Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge" grants program. It was the first large scale, nongovernment funding targeted to the expansion of statewide adult literacy systems, the enhancement of state-level adult literacy leadership, and the infusion of large numbers of new adult literacy trainers, tutors, and students. It also reflected the Foundation leadership's recognition of "the growing importance of state governments and associations of nonprofit organizations and private businesses in alerting their members to local needs and ways to meet them and in building public awareness of literacy issues" (Eugene C. Dorsey, Gannett Foundation President, 8/14/86).

The Foundation convened a 19-member advisory board of leaders in adult literacy who contributed ideas and recommendations about administrative and policy issues likely to be faced during the life of the project. Organizations represented on the advisory board included:

- Adult Literacy Task Force of the National Governors' Association
- American Association for Adult and Continuing Education
- American Broadcasting Corporation
- Business Council for Effective Literacy

- Business Council of New York State
- Chicago Public Schools
- Council of State Policy and Planning Agencies
- Education Commission of the States
- IBM
- International Reading Association
- Laubach Literacy Action
- Literacy Volunteers of America
- National Council of La Raza
- National Urban League, Inc.
- Philadelphia Mayor's Commission on Literacy
- Public Broadcasting Service
- SER-Research and Policy Institute
- U.S. Department of Education
- U.S. Department of Labor

In addition, Gannett Foundation staff carefully reviewed the state of the art of adult literacy with the intent to maximize—through targeting long-range goals and objectives—the impact of the Foundation's available funds. Actual co-judges of the submitted proposals were Christy C. Bulkeley, Gannett Foundation Vice President, and manager of the Foundation's adult literacy programs, and Betty Sullivan, Curriculum Services Manager for CLASSLINE, USA TODAY's educational program. Beginning with the second year, Joan Baraloto replaced Betty Sullivan. USA TODAY, a national general interest daily newspaper launched in 1982, is published by Gannett Co., Inc. and has extensively covered the issues of adult illiteracy for several years. CLASSLINE provides literacy instruction materials for elementary, secondary, and adult students in all 50 states. In Year 2, Joan Baraloto, USA TODAY's Director of Educational Services, also participated in judging proposals.

The RFP was issued in September 1986 with a submission deadline of December 31, 1986. The Literacy Challenge was described as follows:

> The Literacy Challenge. A competitive $2 million state-level grants program. The Gannett Foundation, in cooperation with USA TODAY, challenges you to come up with a plan that will help unify, coordinate, strengthen and expand adult literacy activities within your state. Grants of $40,000 to $100,000 are available for first-year support of a state-level adult literacy project.

Several assumptions and premises were reflected in the RFP: (1) that the best initiatives would be developed through the competitive bid process; (2) that specific initiatives should "come from the field" rather than as priorities or dictates from the Gannett Foundation; (3) that systems development requires the cooperation of different levels of government and the private sector working together; (4) that there is a general receptivity to public/private sector efforts which involve nonprofit organizations, businesses, and government; and (5) that coordinated efforts will have more impact than fragmented ones.

The goals of the program, as clearly stated in the RFP, were: (1) to strengthen statewide adult literary efforts through coordination of agencies; (2) to teach more adults to read by involving more volunteers as tutors; (3) to increase the resources available to literacy agencies; and (4) to generate greater public awareness of the problem of adult literacy and how individuals, groups, and communities can help.

The Gannett Foundation was firmly committed to the premise that coordinated efforts were needed to expand adult literacy systems. The criteria for eligible applicants, carefully thought out and thoroughly detailed in the RFP, reflected this premise. The RFP solicited proposals from (1) any statewide nonprofit organization, already operating adult literacy programs, with the capacity to create and anchor a broad coalition which includes other public or private nonprofit groups or agencies; (2) any existing state literacy coalition, or group acting on behalf of a coalition, that seeks to expand specific adult literacy services or add new services; (3) any adult literacy organization located in a major city, but not operating statewide, that has the capability to expand into or to launch statewide literacy programs; and (4) any branch of state government that has major adult literacy activities or interest, and seeks to expand and/or coordinate literacy efforts and services. Creation or expansion of literacy programs in a single governmental department or agency were not eligible activities. Government applicants were further directed that they might act on behalf of a public/nonprofit collaboration or on behalf of a comprehensive, multiple-agency government group. It was suggested that in the latter case, job training, corrections, social services, volunteer bureaus, and relevant legislative representatives should be included.

In addition to specifying the applicant eligibility requirements, the RFP provided examples of appropriate generic activities such as: (1) creating or expanding a statewide literacy coalition; (2) creating or expanding multiple-agency efforts; and (3) consolidating and expanding state government efforts. More specific examples included "increasing the number of adult nonreaders in tutoring programs," "establishing a statewide agenda," "providing technical assistance to new and existing local literacy groups," and "creating a statewide adult literacy information and referral service." Ineligible activities were also indicated.

Detailed information was provided as to the format and information to be included in submitted proposals, including first-year program goals; specific, measurable activities, expected results and effects of illiteracy in the state; ways of measuring progress and documenting results; plans for dissemination of information gained; and plans for continuing the project once Gannett Foundation funding was expended.

Finally, applicants were provided information about the criteria which would be used to judge their proposals. The most essential element was the following: "Signs of a unified initiative at the state level - whether nonprofit, private, or government - to provide coherent leadership and support for adult literacy efforts. A single proposal that shows evidence of strong cooperation among key state groups and agencies will receive more consideration than will multiple applications from individual agencies in the state. All state literacy interests are urged to agree on a highest priority and develop a single proposal, or to cooperate in reviewing different proposals to make sure the single strongest proposal is submitted." This issue was so important in the perspective of the Gannett Foundation that the occurrence of two competing submissions from a state usually (although not always) precluded that state from receiving an award since, by definition, it implied lack of a unified, coordinated effort.

Although three of the funded proposals were not statewide in nature, but rather regional (Puerto Rico) or city-based (Bridgeport, Connecticut and Providence, Rhode Island), in each case there was state-level sponsorship and the intention was to eventually disseminate and replicate the initiative throughout the state.

Yet another critical element in the selection process was "the apparent ability to continue the proposed project and sustain its growth beyond the grant period." This issue proved to be one of the most complicated and interesting aspects in assessing the impact of the Literacy Challenge grants. (See Chapter 4 for information on the eventual "fate" of the projects.)

A. Year 1 Awards

On February 26, 1987, the Gannett Foundation announced Year 1 awards to 12 states and Puerto Rico. The grants, totaling more than $1.25 million, were intended to support the development and expansion of coalitions, with the ultimate intention of permanently increasing and improving adult literacy services. Within these generic goals, plans for addressing specific unique literacy needs were identified and highlighted by the winning proposals. Targeted strategies included outreach and provision of services (including the use of new technologies) to populations in need of bilingual education; those living in remote rural areas; and those with learning disabilities. Other projects described plans for reducing the social and economic barriers to receiving adult literacy services through the innovative involvement of other systems such as private sector workplaces, public housing projects, and prisons.

The winners were chosen from among 75 proposals totaling $10 million from 48 states, the District of Columbia, two United States territories, and a commonwealth. Multiple, competing proposals were submitted by 16 states. Proposal co-sponsors represented a wide variety of sources, including Governors' Offices, volunteer literacy organizations, state education and library departments, public housing tenants' associations, labor unions, businesses, and public and private universities. As stated in February 1987 by Gannett Foundation President Eugene C. Dorsey, "We had planned to award $1 million in grants for the first year of the Literacy Challenge, but we received so many exceptional proposals that we felt compelled to increase the funding."

Winning proposals came from Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Nevada, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Tennessee, Texas and Washington state. Appendix A contains a comprehensive listing of each initiative's goals and objectives. Brief summaries of the Year 1 proposals and Year 2 plans follow:

Illinois

Year 1. Awarded $100,000, the Illinois Literacy Resource Development Project proposal, submitted by the Illinois State Board of Education, acted on behalf of six key nonprofit and state government literacy organizations. The project goal was to devise and carry out strategies by which local literacy groups could become more self-sufficient through activities such as raising more money and obtaining additional resources. Task Forces would up be set up to provide oversight to major project activities. Among the goals of interest to the Gannett Foundation was "marketing contractual literacy services to businesses seeking to reduce illiteracy among their workers". The state had already invested more than $8.5 million in local adult literacy activities in the preceding two years through appropriations for specific adult literacy efforts, libraries, adult education programs, and job training.

Year 2. The project received continuation funds of $50,000 in Year 2. New activities included the conversion of the Coalition into an independent statewide 501(c)(3) organization, to be called the Resource Development and Communication Center.

Indiana

Year 1. Awarded $91,000, the Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition proposal, submitted by the Indiana Department of Education, involved a coalition established by law in 1986, itself the evolution of a long-standing Governor's Task Force. The project sought to set up regional organizing and training task forces to provide local literacy groups with technical assistance and specialized help more quickly and less expensively than in the past. Goals also included a statewide public awareness campaign and the development of a uniform system to keep track of volunteer tutor and adult learner activities.

Year 2. The project received continuation funds of $45,500 in Year 2. Activities included the continuation of the region-based technical assistance and specialist referrals, conduct of topical workshops, and the development of a certification process.

Maine

Year 1. Awarded $99,000, the Maine Literacy Coalition proposal, submitted by the Department of Education and Cultural Services, Division of Adult and Community Education, sought to convert an existing PLUS Literacy Task Force into a permanent, expanded statewide coalition. Goals included increased training for literacy groups and for agencies dealing with adult nonreaders (including businesses and social services); establishment of more local literacy task forces; increased library participation in promoting adult literacy; and expanded use of improvisational theater groups to promote public awareness about adult illiteracy.

Year 2. The project received continuation funds of $49,000 in Year 2. New activities were to increase the number of workplace and library programs; provide more in-service training to tutors; develop a permanent funding base for the Coalition; complete the evaluation of the effectiveness of the improvisational theater; and the achieve self-sufficiency by the theater troupes.

Massachusetts

Year 1. Awarded $100,000, the Massachusetts Coalition for Adult Literacy proposal, submitted by Literacy Volunteers of Massachusetts, Inc., funded an information and referral service, activities for coordinating statewide literacy instruction, and efforts to raise additional funds. The proposal indicated that although state agencies and volunteer groups had well-established funding and programs already in place, no real coordination existed among them; the project would rectify this lack.

Year 2. The project received continuation funds of $50,000 in Year 2. The project intended to continue developing and expanding coalition support to local literacy providers, regional coalitions, state government, and nonprofit organizations.

Minnesota

Year 1. Awarded $100,000, the Minnesota Adult Literacy Coalition proposal, submitted by the Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign, Inc., had several goals, each associated with one of the four major organizations involved as the project's coalition. Goals included focusing on learning disabled adult nonreaders; increasing the use of computer-assisted literacy instruction; and increasing public awareness, training, and information and referral activities.

Year 2. The project received continuation funds of $50,000 in Year 2. Basic activities, including training of trainers, technical assistance, and the telephone hotline, were ongoing. Project staff proposed to expand efforts to reach learning disabled adults throughout the state.

Nevada

Year 1. Awarded $99,000, the Nevada Literacy Coalition proposal, submitted by the Nevada State Library and Archives agency, sought to form Nevada's first statewide adult literacy coordination effort. Created in response to the Literacy Challenge, the Coalition involved key state agencies, colleges, and traditional and minority-related, nonprofit organizations. Its intended goals included supporting literacy in rural areas with no adult literacy services; public awareness; developing a state hotline and clearinghouse; and creating a long-range plan.

Year 2. The project received continuation funds of $48,000 in Year 2. Activities remained essentially the same as those of Year 1 plus the development of programs for casino employees. Staff also sought to bring more key state organizations and agencies into the Coalition and the adult literacy system. In the Bonus year, the project received continuation funds of $29,000 (described below).

Oregon

Year 1. Awarded $91,000, the Oregon Literacy Connection proposal, submitted by Oregon State University, was the first statewide coordinator of adult literacy services. The coalition sought to provide comprehensive technical and organizing assistance to local literacy groups, as well as create literacy instruction materials for adults with learning disabilities, including vision and hearing loss. Other proposed activities were developing local service evaluation capabilities, conducting basic information and referral, developing a clearinghouse on tutor training, and expanding an adult education newsletter to include adult literacy.

Year 2. The project received continuation funds of $45,500 in Year 2. Proposed activities were essentially the continuation of those conducted in Year 1.

Pennsylvania

Year 1. Awarded $100,000, the Pennsylvania State Coalition for Adult Literacy proposal, submitted by the Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy of Pennsylvania State University, sought to organize an emerging statewide literacy coalition, support local coalition organizing through the provision of staff and seed money, and develop a computer-based referral system for groups needing specialized technical assistance. Additional grants were expected from state sources for specialized regional training in resource building involving business and industry. Pennsylvania State University had already received Gannett Foundation funds in 1986-87 for adult literacy and technology.

Year 2. The project received continuation funds of $50,000 in Year 2. Proposed activities were essentially the continuation of those conducted in Year 1.

Puerto Rico

Year 1. Awarded $100,000, the Bilingual, Bicultural Literacy Program proposal, submitted by the Department of Education, stressed that Puerto Rico had no notable literacy programs for nonreaders. The project would create a pilot volunteer literacy program involving various agencies in one regional district with eventual expansion to other districts. The project was to be interdisciplinary, bilingual, and bicultural. The program was to be replicated (or modified and installed) in the six other districts of Puerto Rico by the end of the decade.

Year 2. The project received continuation funds of $48,000 in Year 2. The success of the district-specific activities in Year 1 had led to the Education Department's commitment to continue support in the first district and to participate in the expansion of project activities to a second district.

Rhode Island

Year 1. Awarded $82,000, the Workplace and Public Housing Literacy Project proposal, submitted by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education, proposed to pilot workplace and public housing adult literacy classes by using teleconferencing to provide tailored instruction to special needs students at places where they work and/or live. The project was a cooperative effort of employers, unions, the Providence Housing Authority, and a tenants' association. Rhode Island had adult literacy services available throughout the state, including a formal coalition and various partnerships.

Year 2. The project received continuation funds of $35,900 in Year 2. Staff proposed the additional development of literacy instruction to multiple sites. Two more public housing sites were to be added, as well as up to 16 industry sites. English as a Second Language, tutor training, and teacher training in the use of the teleconferencing system were also anticipated.

Tennessee

Year 1. Awarded $100,000, the Tennessee Adult Literacy Coalition proposal, submitted by the Tennessee Community Education Association, intended to build statewide coordination of adult literacy services which had been historically blocked by disputes among existing groups. The intent was to provide regional train-the-trainer workshops in rural and mountain communities, focused on organizational development and services. Also intended was the establishment of the state's first literacy reference, referral, and resource clearinghouse. The coalition was also to work with the Governor in the establishment of a statewide agenda and associated action plan.

Year 2. The project received continuation funds of $50,000 in Year 2. In addition to the continuation of the literacy clearinghouse and the regional training teams established in the first year, project staff proposed four new activities: advanced training workshops to strengthen local program management and funding; new urban and rural workplace projects; work with the Governor's new Youth Literacy Corps; and the development of additional business and legislative support.

Texas

Year 1. Awarded $100,000, the Texas Literacy Council proposal, submitted by the University of Texas at Austin, was created with funds allocated at the recommendation of a Governor's literacy task force. The Texas grant was rescinded during the year due to a lack of project-related activity.

Washington

Year 1. Awarded $88,600, the Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy proposal, submitted by Washington Literacy (Laubach), was designed to develop one model workplace literacy project. Staff funded by the project were also to aid local literacy groups in the management of programs and resources, and to maintain an information and referral hotline. The Coalition had been operating informally for three years, and funds from the Literacy Challenge grants program would support increased activity, including the development of a statewide agenda.

Year 2. The project received continuation funds of $44,000 in Year 2. Activities were to include the continuation of basic coalition services begun in the first year, and the addition of follow-up checks on hotline referrals, the development of workplace literacy projects, and the public awareness efforts previously handled by the disbanded PLUS Literacy Task Force.

Also seriously considered, but not awarded for Year 1 funding, were grants to three states which subsequently applied for, and won, Year 2 awards: Connecticut, California, and New York.

B. Year 2 Awards

Applications for the "second and final" Literacy Challenge grants program were due by December 31, 1987. The Year 2 RFP indicated that the Gannett Foundation, originally committed to a $2 million program, had increased its total commitment to $2.2 million, of which $1.25 million had been awarded to 13 organizations in early 1987. The Foundation was providing the remaining $1 million in the second year, of which $500,000 was earmarked for new grants and the remainder for renewals of existing grants. Grants of $40,000 to $100,000 would be considered. Renewal applicants were cautioned that the maximum allowable grant in the second year would be equal to 50 percent of the first grant (minus whatever portion of that grant paid for capital items such as equipment).

The basic goals of the Literacy Challenge grants program remained essentially the same as those indicated in the Year 1 application, as did the criteria for eligible organizations and for appropriate activities. Only one new suggested activity was included in this second RFP: "training state employees who have contact with percentages of adults needing help reading," listed under the general activities of coordinating and expanding state government efforts. Ineligible activities remained the same. One new piece of information was required as part of the proposal: a list of participants who developed the proposal, as well as those on the oversight board or committee; and one new selection criterion was added—participation by statewide organizations serving individuals expected to benefit from literacy services.

Not included in the first RFP, but included in the second, was a listing of the National Advisory Board. This 19-member group assisted the Gannett Foundation with recommendations on administrative and policy issues throughout the implementation of the Literacy Challenge grants program.

Re-applicants were asked to consider their original thoughts at the time of their first proposal, but to adjust second-year goals as appropriate to the experiences they had gained over the preceding year. They were also reminded that, "As in the original proposals, priorities should be determined at your end, not ours." Reflective of a theme running through virtually all of the Gannett Foundation communication, projects were asked to specify what they believed to be the reasonable likelihoods or prospects for future, continued support beyond the availability of Gannett Foundation funds. Multiple-state, regional, and/or national dissemination of products was excluded from eligible 1988 activities.

"New" applications (those not funded in Year 1) were received from 36 states (all but Idaho and North Carolina), Guam, and Samoa.

On February 16, 1988, the Gannett Foundation announced the 21 recipients of the second round of the Literacy Challenge grants program, yet again expanding, to a total $1.35 million. All Year 1 winners, except Texas, received renewal grants. Approximately $800,000 was allocated to 9 new projects, with approximately $525,000 for the renewals. The original grant to Texas was rescinded (based on a lack of project-related activity) and reallocated to the funding pool. These commitments rounded out the two-year, $2.5 million competitive grant program initiated in late 1986.

New winning proposals came from Alabama, Alaska, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Kentucky, Mississippi, New Mexico, and New York. Existing projects, funded in the first year of the Challenge Grants, in Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Oregon, Nevada, Pennsylvania, Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Tennessee, and Washington state received renewal funding. To summarize, during these two years of the program, 33 grants (including renewals) totaling $2.5 million were made to projects in 20 states (not including the rescinded Texas grant) and Puerto Rico.

Appendix A contains a comprehensive listing of each initiative's goals and objectives. Brief summaries of the new winning projects follow:

Alabama

Awarded $75,000, the Alabama Literacy Coalition proposal, submitted by the Alabama Public Library Service, sought to provide leadership and capacity-building through the provision of basic services, including a monthly newsletter, brochures, a directory, task forces, two statewide conferences, training, and technical assistance. Little state level adult literacy activities existed within Alabama, although a literacy hotline was in place.

Alaska

Awarded $77,000, the Alaska Literacy Challenge Coalition proposal, submitted by Nine Star Enterprises, Inc., proposed the development of three initiatives adding to the state's system capacity. Train-the-trainers would add new trainers and students in outlying regions of Alaska; a public awareness campaign would generate new local coalitions with communities, libraries, and businesses (with federal Job Training Partnership Act funds); and an existing, library-based, "parents and tots" program would be expanded to other sites. Strong private participation was indicated, including funding for a toll-free referral line. In the Bonus Year, this project received continuation funds of $38,000 (described below).

California

Awarded $100,000, the California Alliance for Literacy proposal, submitted by the State Department of Education in cooperation with the Alliance for Literacy (a statewide coalition) proposed to increase the capacity of government and other appropriate agencies to identify nondrying adults so that they could be referred for literacy programs. Positing that the adult literacy system, state-funded through libraries, was not reaching sufficient numbers of black adults (5 percent of students vs. 13 percent in the general population), this strategy was endorsed by the national, black Assault on Illiteracy Program (AOIP). Specific activities were to include upgrading of an inventory and directory of literacy services, the development of training materials, and the conduct of training of caseworkers and others.

Connecticut

Awarded $89,000, the Connecticut Coalition for Literacy proposal, submitted by the Connecticut Department of Education, sought to increase the involvement of the city of Bridgeport's minority community as students and tutors working with traditional literacy providers. Partners included the city's black ministerial association, the Mayor's Literacy Commission, and public schools. Churches would help recruit adult nonreaders and volunteers for tutoring, providing the link and two-way support for the initiative. In the Bonus Year, the project received continuation funds of $44,000 (described below).

Delaware

Awarded $51,000, the Delaware Coalition for Literacy proposal, submitted by the Delaware Department of Public Instruction, generally sought to involve more volunteers and to expand adult literacy services. Activities were to include improvement of the statewide information and referral system; development of a parent-child teaching approach; generation of greater business involvement; and training of more teachers and volunteers to work together in various class and small group learning situations.

Kentucky

Awarded $99,800, the Kentucky Literacy Coalition proposal, submitted by the Kentucky Foundation for Literacy, Inc., proposed to expand the state system and develop needed training kits. The Foundation for Literacy, established before the Literacy Challenge grants program, was created to develop and manage funds for adult literacy activities. Project partners included the Department of Education, the Governor's Literacy Commission, and KET, the state's educational television network. Activities included regional technical assistance teams and regional workshops; six video-based kits for tutor training, and for program management improvement (designed for national applicability); and four model program plans (community, school, library and community service) developed to help upgrade existing organizations or create new ones.

Mississippi

Awarded $100,000, the Mississippi Literacy Coalition proposal, submitted by the State Department of Education, sought to reduce the percentage of adult learners who drop out of the literacy system after basic instruction; to develop ways to keep such students involved in the system; and to generally expand the state literacy system. This first state literacy coalition had evolved as a result of the first Literacy Challenge request for proposals (Mississippi was not funded in Year 1), with participation of government, nonprofit, and private businesses. Other planned basic coalition activities included start-up of a hotline, development of regional training and technical assistance teams, and the strengthening of interagency involvement. The project's systemic attempt to address the transition problem (after basic instruction was concluded) was of particular interest to the Gannett Foundation.

New Mexico

Awarded $100,000, the New Mexico Coalition for Literacy proposal, submitted by the New Mexico Coalition for Literacy (a 501(c)(3) organization), received funds for basic start-up activities; and for the development of high-potential model local projects, each of which was to receive $10,000 "seed money" as well as technical assistance to improve documentation and evaluation for possible replication. Two Indian Pueblos, a Hispanic job training organization, and two community service agencies located in sparsely populated counties (with high levels of illiteracy) were included. Production and distribution of a directory was also planned. In the Bonus Year, this project received continuation funds of $49,000 (described below).

New York

Awarded $100,000, the State Literacy Council proposal, submitted by the New York State Literacy Council, sought to involve adult learners and volunteer tutors in the development of a long-range agenda for the state's literacy movement. Caucuses, organized by PLUS Literacy Task Forces and literacy coalitions with help from VISTA Volunteers, were to be held in 11 regions. Recommendations on local services and needs priorities from these caucuses would be presented at a statewide convention for final prioritization and agreement on a comprehensive action plan. The Gannett Foundation was particularly interested in the element of involving adult learners and volunteers in the development of problem solving and long-range planning.

As with the round of applications the previous year, Gannett Foundation officials were pleased with the response to the availability of the Year 2 Literacy Challenge grants. Gannett Foundation President Eugene C. Dorsey commented: "From the quality of the new proposals as well as the success so far of the renewal projects, we believe these states have taken major steps toward providing adults with coordinated, effective opportunities to learn to read." Gannett Foundation Vice President Christy Bulkeley wrote: "Once again, the competition has generated a wealth of ideas and plans to expand and improve adult literacy services throughout the USA. Together, all of the applications conveyed a sense of urgency and of demand growing faster than resources. At the same time, they showed increasing cooperation from organizations and government agencies whose participation is important to building long-term capacity in the adult literacy system." And in a related statement, USA TODAY President Tom Curley said: "In addition to encouraging collaborative statewide literacy efforts, these projects take innovative approaches to meeting different, specialized needs of adult learners in various sections of the states."

C. Bonus Awards

In December 1988, the Gannett Foundation announced to the Literacy Challenge project managers that a limited number of renewal grants would be made in 1989. This funding extended the Foundation's initiative, undertaken in cooperation with USA TODAY, into a third year, for a total commitment of nearly $2.7 million allocated over the three-year period. Gannett Foundation President Eugene C. Dorsey stated in a news release: "Although we originally planned to limit Literacy Challenge to two years, we did want to remain flexible enough to respond to promising programs and approaches that we hoped would emerge."

All 21 of the operating projects (from 20 states and Puerto Rico) in the initial two years of the Literacy Challenge grants program were eligible to apply for the third year bonus funding; 17 did so. All potential applicants were reminded that the Gannett Foundation was committed to the permanent expansion of adult literacy systems and the involvement of more volunteers and students. Dissemination of materials and other-state training were strongly suggested activities. Winners were selected on the basis of their previous Literacy Challenge accomplishments and the potential for further progress as reflected in their bonus proposals.

On March 1, 1989, the Gannett Foundation announced the awarding of "Bonus Grants" to four projects. The grants, totaling approximately $160,000, were made to Alaska, Connecticut, Nevada, and New Mexico. For three of these projects, the Bonus Grants represented second year funding; for the fourth, Nevada, the Bonus Grant was third year funding. Brief summaries of the four winning proposals follow:

Alaska

Awarded $38,000, the Alaska Literacy Challenge Coalition sought to continue the expansion of the state's literacy services by training tutor trainers for state prisons and for a retail chain, the Alaska Commercial Company. Also, 10 library-based programs were to be established, and the hotline continued.

Connecticut

Awarded $44,000, the Connecticut Coalition for Literacy was to continue the innovative program in Bridgeport linking a coalition of black churches and the Mayor's Literacy Coalition. Tutors and adult learners were being recruited from the churches' congregations. A guidebook was to be developed to help other cities start similar programs.

Nevada

Awarded $29,000, the Nevada Literacy Coalition was to publish a manual on managing volunteers in literacy programs, and to conduct related workshops. The Coalition would continue working closely with the state's Office of Volunteerism to organize volunteer-based literacy programs throughout the state.

New Mexico

Awarded $49,000, the New Mexico Coalition for Literacy sought to continue its efforts to organize and train literacy organizations around the state, particularly those addressing the needs of Indian populations and other rural areas of the state. The Coalition would also maintain the state's first literacy directory and an information and referral hotline.

In sum, the Literacy Challenge requirement for a coalition-based grant application resulted in a large number of projects (21), diverse in their planned efforts, as well as their aspirations and expectations. Other results of the initiative were as follows: (1) 11 states and Puerto Rico were successful in obtaining funds for both years; (2) nine additional states were able to develop a successful proposal for the second year of funding; (3) four states were successful in obtaining "Bonus" grants; (4) of these four, three (New Mexico, Alaska, and Connecticut) had not received Year 1 grants (and hence, the Bonus grant was in essence a "second year" award), and for the fourth (Nevada), funded for both Years 1 and 2, the Bonus grant was in essence a "third year" grant; (5) 29 states submitted an application during one or both of the competitions but were never funded; (6) only one state (North Carolina) did not apply in either Year 1 or Year 2; and (7) only one state (Texas) received a grant which was subsequently rescinded.

Once the awards were made, Gannett Foundation staff worked over the three years of the Literacy Challenge grants program to support the projects' efforts to fulfill their objectives. In addition to writing and responding to regular correspondence (letters, reports, newsletters, and products) from the projects, the Gannett Foundation convened three gatherings of the grantees to share their efforts and activities. Some technical assistance was provided at these project manager meetings: specific topics included possible roles for attorneys and bar associations; budget and policy development; and reaching underserved individuals and communities.

In addition, Gannett Foundation staff helped the projects make themselves visible in their own communities. For example, the Foundation sent letters to appropriate print, radio, and television media sources in each state describing the "products" being developed by its state coalition and indicating that the materials would be shared with local providers. News releases from the Gannett Foundation accompanied each award announcement and were sent to the local press.

Toward the end of the Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge grant period, Welfare Research, Inc. (WRI) began this assessment to document the activities of the 21 projects involved in the initiative. WRI also wrote Individual Project Reports which record the goals and objectives, successes and failures, and activities and products for each participating state. A separate document, the Products List, lists products by type for each state.

D. Summaries of Individual Project Characteristics

This section contains information on the numbers and/or percentages of illiterates reported in each state (Table 1); the amount of Literacy Challenge funds received (Table 2); and the sponsoring fiscal agent for each of the projects (Table 3).

It should be noted that the information reported in Table 1 derives from the original state proposals and is not standardized; that is, the proposal writers used different definitions and methods for determining and reporting the number and/or percentage of illiterates in the state. Also, reported information may have been based on different timeframes; for example, several of the states (but certainly not all) used 1980 Census data. And in some cases, there was no indication as to the source of the reported figures. Nevertheless, a review of the reported numbers gives a general sense of the differences in magnitude faced by the states.

Table 1
Estimated Number or Percentage of Functional Illiterates

States	Percentage or Number
Alabama	220,000; reported from the 1980 Census; another one million with no high school degree or GED
Alaska	14%
California	15% or approximately 3.1 million; reported from the 1980 Census, plus information from an SRA Associates Report
Connecticut	300,000-340,000 statewide; in the city of Bridgeport, 30,000 of the city's 107,000 total population
Delaware	51,000; reported from the 1980 Census; another 125,000 without a high school diploma or GED
Illinois	2,000,000
Indiana	600,000; reported from the 1980 Census; 34% without high school diploma; 22% high school dropout rate (1988 information)
Kentucky	400,000; ranking fiftieth in the nation in the percentage of adults with high school diplomas; "almost 1/2 of all Kentucky citizens over the age of 25 do not have high school diplomas"
Maine	110,000 completed 8 years of schooling or less; reported from the 1980 Census; 239,000 with less than 12 years of school
Massachusetts	95,000; 495,000 with 5-8 years of school; 1.3 million without a high school diploma;
Minnesota	236,000 below 7th grade; reported from United States Department of Education data; 671,000 without a high school diploma, reported from 1980 Census
Mississippi	396,639 (22%, "the highest in the United States"); 714,000 adults without high school diploma, amounting to 46% of the over-16 population not enrolled in school; 47th in the nation in having a high school educated, trained workforce
Nevada	9-13%
New Mexico	260,000 (20% of the adult population)
New York	2.1 million below 6th grade; 4.1 million without a high school diploma
Oregon	150,000 (7%); 452,030 (24%) without a high school diploma; 22-24 percent estimated dropout rate
Pennsylvania	2,644,000 (30%); fourth in the nation with the greatest number of people without a high school diploma, 1986 data
Puerto Rico	15.5%; an additional 17.5 % estimated as being functionally illiterate
Rhode Island	35% (255,929)
Tennessee	435,058 adults with less than an eighth grade education; 745,281 with more than an eighth grade education but less than a high school diploma
Washington	465,000 (15%)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The Year 1 RFP stated that the Literacy Challenge grants program was to be a two-year, $2 million program. First year grants ranging from $40,000 to $100,000 would be awarded. In Year 2, the Gannett Foundation would make conditional second year renewals as well as competitive grants.

The Year 2 RFP stated that $1 million would be provided in 1988, of which $500,000 was to be earmarked for new grants (applications of $40,000 to $100,000 would be considered), and the remainder for renewals of existing programs. All of the existing programs (12, not including the rescinded Texas grant) were refunded at approximately half of their Year 1 level. Table 2 presents a summary of funds received by state and year.

Table 2
Challenge Grant Funds Received

States	Year 1	Year 2	Bonus
Alabama		$75,000	
Alaska		77,000	$38,000
California		100,000	
Connecticut		89,000	44,000
Delaware		51,000	
Illinois	$100,000	50,000	
Indiana	91,000	45,500	
Kentucky		100,000	
Maine	99,000	49,000	
Massachusetts	100,000	50,000	
Minnesota	100,000	50,000	
Mississippi		100,000	
Nevada	99,000	48,000	29,000
New Mexico		100,000	49,000
New York		100,000	
Oregon	91,000	45,500	
Pennsylvania	100,000	50,000	
Puerto Rico	100,000	48,000	
Rhode Island	82,000	36,000	
Tennessee	100,000	50,000	
Washington	88,600	44,000	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State agencies sponsored 11 projects, and nongovernment entities sponsored 10, although 2 (Pennsylvania and Oregon) of the 10 were sponsored by state universities. Of these two, Oregon State University was much closer to state government than was Pennsylvania State University. While established as a 501(c)(3) in 1984, the New York Literacy Council actually functions as a subcommittee reporting to the State Education Commissioner. Three of the state-agency-sponsored initiatives (Illinois, Maine, and Delaware) evolved into nonprofit 501(c)(3) organizations; and one project (Tennessee) sponsored by a nonprofit organization transferred sponsorship to yet another 501(c)(3) organization. The implications of public sponsorship versus private sponsorship are discussed in Chapter 3, Section 3, Operating Environments.

Table 3
Sponsoring Agency

STATES	STATE SPONSOR	NONPROFIT SPONSOR
Alabama	Public Library Service	
Alaska		Nine Star Enterprises, Inc.
California	Department of Education	
Connecticut	Department of Education	
Delaware	Department of Public Instruction [later evolved into a 501(c)(3)]	
Illinois	Board of Education [later evolved into a nonprofit 501(c)(3)]	
Indiana	Department of Education	
Kentucky		Kentucky Foundation for Literacy, Inc.
Maine	Department of Education and Cultural Services [later evolved into a nonprofit 501(c)(3)]	
Massachusetts		Literacy Volunteers of Massachusetts, Inc.
Minnesota		Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign, Inc.
Mississippi	Department of Education	
Nevada	State Library and Archives	
New Mexico		New Mexico Coalition for Literacy
New York		New York State Literacy Council
Oregon		Oregon State University, Post-Secondary Education
Pennsylvania		Pennsylvania State University, College of Education, Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy
Puerto Rico	Department of Education	
Rhode Island	Department of Elementary and Secondary Education	
Tennessee	Tennessee Community Education Association [In Year 2, the newly formed 501(c)(3), Tennessee Literacy Coalition, Inc. became the fiscal agent for the Coalition.]	
Washington		Washington Literacy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CHAPTER TWO

Significant Activities

As the assessment progressed, it was often difficult to differentiate the specific impacts and outcomes of the Gannett Foundation initiatives from others occurring in a particular state. (This issue is discussed in more detail in Chapter 3, Section C, Operating Environments.) Gannett-Foundation-financed activities were most difficult to tease apart in those states in which adult literacy efforts were well under way at the start of the Literacy Challenge grants. This finding is not surprising since it was one of the intentions of the Gannett Foundation that project funds and activities be used to better coordinate and integrate all existing statewide activities. It was, therefore, not unusual to find that in some states, project activities seeped into virtually all other adult literacy activities. In many of these instances, the Gannett Foundation money, in effect, increased the volume of activity rather than initiated activity. Nevertheless, throughout the Individual Project Reports and this Assessment Report, we have attempted distinguish those activities and accomplishments which can be specifically traced to the Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge grants program.

An example of this problem of "pulling apart" impacts in those states where activities were well under way was the Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition (IALC). The Coalition, initially established in 1983, was composed of three distinct entities: the Governor's Voluntary Action Program (GVAP), the Department of Education, and the State Library. The GVAP itself served a network of local organizations, issued newsletters, and conducted public awareness activities, conferences, and workshops. Specific literacy activities frequently involved even more organizational cooperations. The Literacy Clearinghouse was a joint effort of the IALC, the Adult Education Resource Center, and Ball State University. This Clearinghouse provided a directory and profiles of the provider groups in the state, as well as a toll-free hotline. It also maintained profiles of available literacy resource persons in the state, the "Resource Cadre." The expansion and increased utilization of the Resource Cadre was a major component of the Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge project in the state.

The results of this initiative were generally positive. It is, however, impossible to delineate exactly how much of that success is attributable to the increased resources associated with the Gannett Foundation funds versus the established, ongoing efforts of the Adult Education Resource Center and/or Ball State University.

Similarly, the Minnesota coalition was composed of four mature organizations, each of which performed distinct and unique activities for the Gannett Foundation project. Building upon their existing bases of expertise, each was able to expand upon the activities they were already performing. In essence, the Literacy Challenge grant "swelled" their efforts. In sum, in these two instances, and in some others, the addition of Literacy Challenge monies meant that more could be done, but it was difficult to determine how much activity could be directly attributed to the project rather than to the overall, ongoing initiatives of the organizations involved.

Table 4 summarizes the significant activities of the projects and indicates in which states such activities took place. It should be noted that additional adult literacy activities, not reported here because they were outside the scope of the Gannett Foundation projects, undoubtedly occurred within each state. This would be particularly true in any state in which the adult literacy system was well developed and/or highly active.

Appendix A contains a comprehensive list of the goals and objectives of all of the projects, and Appendix B contains a detailed list of all of the projects' activities. A review of these appendices will give the reader a comprehensive understanding of the diversity of the initiatives, as well as the scope and range of the aspirations held by the projects' staff. Described below are some of the more significant and interesting activities, with specific project examples.

A. Information and Referral

The Gannett Foundation was particularly interested in issues associated with information and referral—usually collected and disseminated from a single source such as a hotline—since such sources would generally yield objective information about the development, size, and scope of adult literacy services within a state. Hence, questions raised by the Gannett Foundation focused on the type of database used by the projects (for example, whether the information was recorded on a computer or on a print, typewriter base), including the format and level of detail collected.

Other questions focused on data base maintenance; level of screening which occurred through the referral mechanism; focus of the referral (to a local central number or to a specific program provider); and call volume (virtually all of the states were requested to collect information on the number of calls and referrals made); and follow-up activities to determine the outcome of the referrals. A final set of activities from the perspective of the Gannett Foundation were those associated with the staff and staff training required to adequately maintain information and referral systems. Needless to say, there was considerable variation among the states in their willingness and ability to collect and maintain this kind of information.

Virtually all of the projects engaged in at least some of the activities associated with information and referral. While typically involving hotline activities, other efforts ranged from printing hotline numbers on shopping bags and creating posters to highly sophisticated, computer-based referral systems for potential students and tutors. In some instances, states were starting from scratch in developing a literacy network; in others, systems were already in place. In those states with already well developed systems, for example Illinois, Washington, New York, and Minnesota, project activities usually were less targeted to the "basics" (such as "public awareness" and "information and referral"), and more focused on activities such "resource development" and "public policy" initiatives.

Briefly described below are selected examples of the information and referral efforts of the projects. Major activities included public awareness efforts, hotlines, directories, newsletters, print materials, and radio and television initiatives. Since the efforts themselves are of interest, information is provided on project "aspirations" even when not very successful.

1. Public Awareness

Almost all of the projects regarded increasing public awareness as a fundamental, ongoing task. Nevertheless, the states differed in the degree to which adult literacy was recognized and understood as a serious issue and hence one which required public awareness efforts. These differences ranged from those states whose economic condition and workplace competencies were so distressed that adult literacy could not be ignored (e.g., Mississippi, Connecticut, Kentucky, and Rhode Island), to those where the problems of

Table 4
Significant Activities

	ALABAMA	ALASKA	CALIFORNIA	CONNECTICUT	DELAWARE	ILLINOIS	INDIANA	KENTUCKY	MAINE	MASSACHUSETTS	MINNESOTA	MISSISSIPPI	NEVADA	NEW MEXICO	NEW YORK	OREGON	PENNSYLVANIA	PUERTO RICO	RHODE ISLAND	TENNESSEE	WASHINGTON
A. Information & Referral	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	✔
Public Awareness	✔	✔			✔		✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔			✔	✔		✔	
Hotlines		✔			✔				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔				✔	✔
Directories	✔	✔	✔		✔					✔		✔	✔	✔	✔		✔			✔	✔
Newsletters	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	✔		✔	✔	✔		✔			✔	✔			✔	
Print Materials	✔	✔				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔				✔	✔
Radio and Television	✔	✔				✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔			✔	✔
B. Recruitment & Training	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Students	✔	✔		✔	✔		✔		✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔			✔	✔	✔	✔
Tutors and/or Aides	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	✔
Teachers and/or Trainers		✔	✔			✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	✔
C. Resource/System Expansion	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Technical Assistance		✔		✔		✔	✔	✔			✔		✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
Local/Regional Task Forces	✔	✔	✔			✔	✔	✔			✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	✔
Information and Reporting Enhancements			✔		✔	✔	✔							✔							
Statewide Conferences	✔	✔			✔		✔					✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔				✔
Statewide Plans	✔								✔	✔			✔	✔	✔	✔					
Public Policy	✔					✔				✔			✔	✔	✔	✔					
D. Evaluations	✔			✔		✔	✔		✔		✔	✔	✔	✔		✔		✔			✔
E. Unique Project Components		✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
Special Populations		✔		✔	✔			✔			✔	✔	✔	✔		✔		✔			
Computer Technology			✔							✔	✔			✔		✔	✔				
Workplace Literacy		✔			✔	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔		✔				✔		✔	✔	✔
Welfare Reform and Literacy																					✔
Family Literacy			✔		✔	✔	✔			✔											

32

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

illiteracy were overlooked by the general public and, to varying extents, the government (e.g., Minnesota). In some instances, the specific goals and objectives of a project did not lend themselves to broad public awareness issues, for example in Rhode Island and Connecticut, where the projects were focused on relatively specific groups and communities.

Tasks associated with increasing public awareness were relatively standard, usually involving awareness campaigns, posters, program brochures, PSAs, special events, billboards, newspaper articles, and public appearances and presentations.

a. Improvisational Theater. Four projects developed theatrical productions as methods for increasing awareness of adult literacy issues (although only two—Maine and Delaware—received Gannett Foundation funds to directly support their theater initiatives). As part of the Minnesota project (MALC), "Catching On" was a one-man production written by Lance Belville and developed in cooperation with the Great North American History Theater. The play wove music and humor through the stories of adults from many walks of life who lack basic reading, writing, and math skills. MALC staff served as resources on literacy to the History Theater staff.

The most ambitious of the theater initiatives was that of the Maine State Literacy Coalition (MSLC). This project tested improvisational theater as a tool for raising public awareness, for teacher and tutor training, and for adult learner recruitment. The stated goals were to provide staff development/tutor training, to deal with sensitive or difficult situations, to change attitudes, and to create awareness and advocacy. The intent of the effort was to train regional theater groups and facilitators to perform skits at selected sites. The theater method had two components: the skits themselves and the discussion following in which the audience interacted with the characters in the skits. The project also developed and produced a videotape to be used by a facilitator to train staff at industry, business, school, and agency sites. Approximately 2,000 people saw the performances each year.

An evaluation report on the theater initiative, completed in December 1988, concluded that: (1) the Theater is an exciting and engaging tool for raising the awareness of literacy issues for practitioners and non-practitioners; (2) it is an effective tool in tutor training; (3) it is not a successful medium in open areas like shopping malls; (4) because the skits were developed and presented by practitioners, the credibility is not questioned; and (5) it influences attitudes (such as increasing sensitivity) more than specific behavior. Recommendations were to: (1) continue using it for tutor training and raising awareness; (2) not use it for direct student recruitment; (3) develop an evaluation form for participants; and (4) continue keeping records.

In its second year, MSLC explored ways to make the Literacy Improvisational Theater self-sufficient, including targeting the performances to businesses and town managers rather than performing by invitation only. At the time of the site visit, the improvisational theater was still active, supported with funds from the Guy Gannett Publishing Company. In addition, audiences were being charged for the performances.

Another component of the MSLC's public awareness efforts was its focus on coordinating activities with the public libraries. The intent was to increase the number of public libraries that own a New Reader book collection; to cooperate on joint ventures like the statewide read-a-thon; and to distribute the bibliography developed by the Adult Education Staff Development Project to all public libraries. These goals were accomplished, and an Improvisational Theater skit highlighting libraries was developed and presented at the Maine Library Association annual statewide conference.

The Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition (IALC) became interested in Maine's improvisational theater and modified it to raise public awareness concerning adult literacy. Originally, the performers were individuals involved in local and state literacy efforts, and the number of presentations was limited by their availability. The IALC modified the procedures by inviting members of the audience to participate in rehearsals or training before each performance. This allowed performances to be made with just one or two contacts to individuals listed in the Literacy Improvisational Theater section of the Resource Cadre Directory. During the second year of the project, the Theater performed approximately 30 times. Local coalition groups also put on performances with the improvisational theater approach.

The New Mexico Coalition for Literacy also developed a theater component as part of its public awareness campaign. In the first year of the Gannett project, the New Mexico Literacy Theater performed at three conferences, including a presentation at the New Mexico Library Association Mini-Conference. In correspondence in late 1990, the Coalition Executive Director indicated that the Theater recently received underwriting from the Mountains and Plains Booksellers Association for a performance within a prison system.

b. Miscellaneous Public Awareness Activities. The Alaska Coalition listed a public awareness campaign as one of its four major first-year goals. Typical of many of the other states, Alaska's activities included developing brochures, posters, and radio and television PSAs, and operating a free statewide 800 number for volunteer and student recruitment and referral. In a more unusual effort, the Alaska Coalition also conducted a legislative teleconference, featuring people from health, social service, and education agencies speaking to legislators in Alaska about the issues of illiteracy in Alaska.

In a major effort to expand public awareness, the Tennessee Literacy Coalition (TLC) developed a literacy clearinghouse. The TLC felt that a clearinghouse would enhance collaborative and cooperative literacy efforts beyond the grant period and reduce the likelihood of service duplication. The clearinghouse performed three primary tasks: (1) as the lead entity, promoting public awareness of illiteracy in Tennessee; (2) identifying and/or developing and disseminating resource materials to assist individuals, organizations, and agencies involved with literacy efforts; and (3) providing ongoing information and referral services. Although the TLC proposed an evaluation strategy of logging clearinghouse activities such as requests, responses, reviews, and any action taken, such information was not collected.

Specific public awareness activities included the creation of public service announcements; production of literacy posters; maintenance of a hotline (used for information and referral on tutors, students, and local programs across the state); newspaper ads which could be modified for use by local providers; and the creation of a standardized theme ("The Tennessee Literacy Challenge") used for brochures, conferences, and other activities.

In addition, a 20-minute video was developed with funds from the TLC and South Central Bell. Entitled "Break the Cycle," the video shows the negative impact of illiteracy on an individual and his/her family, and the positive impact of literacy instruction. Copies were made and distributed to literacy coordinators; however, its use was not tracked. It has not been used on public television.

Somewhat similar to the Tennessee Literacy Coalition, the Nevada Literacy Coalition (NLC) also implemented a comprehensive publicity campaign, with its hotline as a focal point in the plan. The Coalition Advisory Board's Publicity Task Force oversaw the development of items such as weekly ads and newspaper articles on success stories, public service announcements, check inserts, and brochures and cards continuously supplied to public places. In developing the PSAs, which featured the Governor and First Lady, staff consulted with the state Job Training Office, and CALL (Computer Assisted Literacy in Libraries). PSAs also were developed with the PLUS Task Force and the Reading Center of Northern Nevada; these focused on success stories featuring students and tutors involved in literacy programs.

Several unusual publicity activities were conducted by the NLC, having to do with libraries, schools, and the promotion of family literacy. The activities included: Read-A-Thons and Read-Ins held in shopping malls, featuring storytellers and well known entertainers; contests; and programs held in schools and libraries featuring Library of Congress "Year of the Young Reader" materials and ABC/PBS theme and publicity materials on family reading—"Read Together, Share the Joy." Major supermarket chains promoted family literacy with shopping bags printed with messages and graphics to promote reading. Eventually, the Task Force merged with the PLUS Publicity Task Force, which was involved with the media, libraries, schools, churches, businesses, government, and professional organizations, in a coordinated effort to promote family literacy in Nevada.

Increasing public awareness was a long-term priority of the Mississippi statewide literacy agenda. The grant proposal indicated that Educational Television Network would sponsor public messages; articles would be placed in the newsletter of the Mississippi State Department of Education; public announcements about the project would be placed on commercial television and radio stations; presentations would be made at various statewide, regional and national conferences; and a brochure and a technical manual would be developed and disseminated at the statewide literacy conference. According to staff at the time of the site visit, all of these activities were accomplished, but detailed information was not kept.

Other states which identified targeted public awareness efforts included Alabama, Delaware, Kentucky, and Pennsylvania.

2. Hotlines

Many of the projects had a literacy "hotline," providing information and referral services, usually through an 800 number. In a few instances, a hotline was already established in the state, usually covering a limited geographic area. In such cases, for example Minnesota, Alaska, Washington, and Nevada, project activities typically included expanding and maintaining the hotline. In other cases, the hotline had to be developed, along with basic procedures for directing referrals. The hotlines varied considerably in their comprehensiveness (the types and amount of data collected), but most led to the development of directories containing information about literacy programs, as well as additional information in some cases. The primary purposes of the hotlines were to function as referral mechanisms for both prospective students and tutors and to respond to general inquiries concerning adult literacy. Frequently tied to specific media campaigns and special events, hotline use fluctuated even within projects.

The Minnesota Basic Skills Hotline was a good example of a comprehensive hotline resource. In addition to helping match students with tutors, it offered information related to basic reading, writing, math, and oral language. In 1987, the database and caller records were computerized, which allowed staff to continually update and record activity. Massachusetts also established a toll-free hotline and a computerized database of public and private adult literacy programs, related support services, special needs services, volunteer opportunities, and other relevant information.

As a specific goal or objective of their Gannett Foundation grant, some states developed relatively sophisticated procedures and guidelines to enhance the referral process. For example, based on recommendations emerging from a 1988 conference on information and referral needs in the state, the Delaware Literacy Coalition developed and implemented a uniform student referral process to ensure that adults were referred to programs that best met their needs. To enable follow-up and tracking of referrals, a standard form was used when referring students to providers.

In Washington, Western Washington PLUS had established a toll-free literacy hotline for the entire state in September 1986. This was in response to needs identified by the Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy (WACAL) and others. Continuation of this service was an important component of the proposal submitted to the Gannett Foundation both for Year 1 and Year 2 funding.

A procedure for follow-up to ensure successful referrals (including the assurance that potential students and volunteers were connected with a literacy program in a reasonable period of time) was a major concern in developing the Washington State Literacy Hotline; and maintaining and refining this procedure was an important component in the second year. Each caller was referred to an appropriate local program (for students, information was also sent by mail), and was entered into a database. Program coordinators were asked to return Client Follow-up Reports two weeks after they received referral reports from the Hotline. Return of the Client Follow-up Report allowed literacy service providers direct communication with the Hotline Coordinator, and allowed the Hotline to remain updated about most programs. Data were also included in the 1988 Literacy Resource Directory.

In Year 2, WACAL conducted a survey to determine the effectiveness of the referral system. A significant finding was that once students and volunteers become involved with a literacy program, they tended to continue with it; however, many (both students and volunteers) called the Hotline for information but subsequently did not choose to become involved. When contacted, students who chose not to become involved with a literacy program cited a broad range of reasons, such as lack of time, work demands, family or health problems, and program-related problems.

At the end of Year 2, Hotline staff planned to continue to refine and to conduct future surveys on a periodic basis. Also in Year 2, the staff planned to draft a database software marketing plan for the Hotline referral and recordkeeping system, and to locate a software packager/manufacturer for a possible partnership.

A procedures manual, including both Hotline operation and data entry procedures, was developed to facilitate the training of volunteers and to improve the accuracy and efficiency of daily and weekly practices and procedures. Project staff planned to identify a state entity to provide continuing funding and management and to contract with it for Hotline services. Funding for Hotline support was to be matched by Coalition member organizations whose constituents were the recipients of Hotline services; if needed, supplemental support was to be sought from other private or public funding sources. Unfortunately, no such permanent entity was found, and the Hotline was only secure (through various sources of public and private funding) into August 1989.

As an interesting aside, the Washington Commission on Hispanic Affairs distributed Spanish Hotline cards to approximately 200 agencies throughout the state which were serving Spanish-speaking clients and consumers.

At the time of the site visit, Washington Literacy had resumed supporting and managing the Hotline; it was also searching for funds for the Hotline, as no ongoing, stable support had been located.

Similar to Washington, the Nevada project built upon existing hotline activities, by expanding the Northern Nevada Hotline into a single statewide literacy information and referral network, subsequently advertised as the primary source of literacy information in the state. Eventually, a Coalition member organization, the Reading Center of Northern Nevada (acting as a referral and support center for literacy activity focused on public information and student/tutor recruitment), took over the management of the toll-free literacy phone line and gave it a permanent home. At that time, it was reorganized and named the "Reading Information and Referral Center." (The Coalition regarded the development of a secure funding base for the Reading Center as one of its primary objectives. They were successful in this endeavor: the Reading Center eventually moved onto Washoe County funding, and its two employees became county employees.)

The establishment and maintenance of a hotline, and the conduct of its associated activities, were considered major goals for some of the more embryonic projects, for example Mississippi, Nevada, Oregon, Tennessee, Maine, and New Mexico, and even in some more established projects (such as Washington). In Mississippi, the hotline, called the Learning Line, began operating in December 1988. Learning Line was later housed at the United Way and coordinated with the Governor's Office for Literacy (reflecting the shifting responsibilities and roles of the literacy entities Mississippi). Unfortunately, as in some other states, information on use was not collected by the Mississippi Coalition, and hence the original objectives associated with its impact could not be measured.

Somewhat unique among the states, the Pennsylvania Coalition established a hotline only to subsequently discontinue it because of a lack of calls. In their experience, there was less of a need for a statewide 800 number as local coalitions and programs had developed hotlines for student and tutor referrals.

3. Directories

The development of a directory (usually consisting of, at a minimum, information about individual literacy providers) was an exceedingly popular activity among the Literacy Challenge grantees. As referenced above, the development of a directory was usually the outgrowth of hotline activities. Each state reporting a hotline also reported directory development and dissemination.

Expanding the use of an existing statewide inventory of literacy providers was a central activity of the California project (CAL). In early 1986, in cooperation with and funded by the State Department of Education, CAL sponsored a comprehensive inventory and assessment of literacy programs including a re-estimation of need, a survey of service providers, and an examination of business efforts to combat workplace illiteracy. A goal of the Literacy Challenge project was to update and disseminate this directory. The directory in turn would augment three existing 800 numbers and one hotline operating in the state.

Updating the inventory and providing training in its use was intended to (1) increase the number and quality of referrals by literacy service providers to other literacy service providers; (2) encourage communication and coordination among literacy service providers in a given region; (3) promote within a region the development of effective and specialized literacy programs serving specific clientele, as opposed to programs which serve every type of client; (4) increase the efficiency of the literacy service delivery system in the state by using volunteer-based programs more reliably as feeder programs for adult schools and community colleges; and (5) provide an inventory for those areas of the state in which none had been available.

The directory database was designed for regular updating, and was used to produce regional directories of use to both providers and referrers. Two directories were developed and disseminated: the Northern and Central California Directory of Literacy Service Providers and the Southern California Literacy Services Directory.

Also not having to start from scratch, the Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy (WACAL) was able to build upon an existing hotline and an already compiled statewide resource directory (Literacy Resources Directory) of service providers and resources. Gannett Foundation funds were used to maintain and update the hotline and the directory throughout the project. The directory was periodically distributed to literacy programs, libraries, and other interested programs. (A third edition, 1989 Literacy Resources Directory, was published with funds from the State Department of Corrections.)

Another example of existing directory "embellishment" was the Alabama Literacy Programs Directory, published by the Alabama Dropout and Illiteracy Prevention Center of Auburn University. The Alabama project (ALC) updated the directory and distributed copies. And in Delaware, as a result of the Information and Referral Conference, the Delaware Coalition for Literacy revised the Directory of Adult Services to include more information in a matrix format, indexed in several ways.

The Nevada Literacy Coalition produced the Nevada Literacy Directory. Compiled as a reference tool for adult literacy programs, government, private agencies and organizations, school programs, the media, etc., it was targeted to all those "who wish information on where and what is available in Nevada to help close the gap on illiteracy." With the intention of including in the Directory the locations, names of contacts, phone numbers, and complete descriptions of all individual literacy activities across the state, the Coalition developed a coordinated Literacy Activity Reporting System (LARS). For this system, the

the Coalition collected uniform statistics from all volunteer literacy programs; participation by individual literacy programs statewide was encouraged. A computer and associated software were used to track literacy activities. A Directory Update Form was included in the Directory for the purpose of periodically revising the information; updated pages replaced obsolete information.

The Mississippi Literacy Coalition produced the Directory of Mississippi Literacy Programs which also included the locations, names of contacts, phone numbers, and complete descriptions of individual literacy activities across the state. The Coalition's Communications Committee sent a survey to all literacy providers to collect relevant information. The Directory was produced in cooperation and consultation with the Governor's Office of Policy and Planning and disseminated at the Statewide Conference in November 1988. (It was subsequently updated in November 1989 for the Mississippi Literacy Foundation, funded by South Central Bell.)

Other states which developed a directory included Alaska (1990 Directory of Programs and Services), Massachusetts (directory of programs and services), New Mexico (Resource Directory of Adult Literacy and Basic Education Programs), Oregon (directory of literacy services), Pennsylvania (Directory of Local Literacy Organizations), and Tennessee (directory of information for networking and referral).

4. Newsletters

Many of the projects developed or expanded upon a statewide literacy newsletter, targeted to literacy providers, relevant government entities, legislators, etc. In Minnesota, "Connections" provided information to the provider network. In Alabama, the newsletter was known as "Literacy Connection." Reflective of Alabama's focus on the acknowledgment of tutor contributions, its newsletter played a major role in the state's "Tutor of the Month" recognition strategy. The Massachusetts newsletter, "MCAL News," focused on private and public funding sources and relevant policy issues. Typical of others, the Nevada Literacy Coalition produced its newsletter, known as "LIT-LINK" (1987-1989) and later as "Literacy Coalition Updates," as a communication and training tool for literacy programs. Also, a series of memos, "LINK-UP," was sent to program coordinators with information on volunteer program management issues. Other newsletters included Alaska's "FOCUS," Connecticut's "Literacy Letter," and Illinois's "Resource Development News."

Although approved for Gannett Foundation funding, the Pennsylvania Coalition did not develop its own newsletter. The Coalition decided that there were enough newsletters and focused instead on contributing Coalition and special projects' information through newsletter inserts to others' (mostly local) newsletters. In some other instances, for example Oregon, project staff "piggy-backed" their news items onto existing other newsletters rather than use resources to develop their own capacities.

5. Print Materials

Virtually all of the projects developed print materials to publicize their own activities, to generally expand awareness of literacy issues, and to recruit potential students and tutors. Typical activities included printing inserts and/or postcards for government welfare and unemployment checks; creating posters (sometimes using famous, and other times, local individuals); and distributing materials, and maintaining information receptacles, at public offices (such as utilities, Employment, Motor Vehicles, Social Services and Health, public defender offices, probation and parole offices, etc.).

Unusual efforts included targeting parents in Head Start and new parents using the services of hospital maternity wards in Nevada. The Minnesota project also distributed materials to Head Start parents, as well as to YMCA/YWCAs and food pantries. The Maine Coalition and the Bangor Daily News placed a toll-free number on bowling lane score sheets (used by approximately 10,000 people a month) as a way to recruit students. The Connecticut project used billboards to advertise its program, as did the Indiana Coalition. Indiana also distributed 13,500 bookmarks and 2650 bumper stickers, and created an eight-foot wide, freestanding display unit to publicize adult literacy at public events. The New Mexico project had its name and 800 number printed on pencils, which the project director then vigorously passed out in her travels around the state.

6. Radio and Television

Many projects created public service announcements (PSAs) for television, radio, and newspapers. Examples included: Alabama (10-, 20-, and 30-second radio spots); Alaska (PSAs, "They Cannot Read: An Alaskan Look at Illiteracy" and another featuring Alaska's First Lady Michael Cowper); Indiana (radio PSAs for nonreaders and volunteers, and 15- and 30-second television PSAs); Maine (PSA on business and literacy); Massachusetts (30-second PSA); Minnesota (30- and 60-second general awareness radio PSAs and a 30-second television commercial); Nevada (publicity PSAs for television and radio); New Mexico (television and radio PSAs); and Tennessee (three 30-second PSAs, as well as a 20-minute videotape, "Break the Cycle").

Illustrating its intent to reach out to public sector clients, the Washington Coalition developed a PSA advertising its hotline which was subsequently installed in selected community service waiting rooms. The PSA was developed in both Spanish and English.

Several of the projects' radio and television efforts (and associated print materials) included political figures. For example, the Pennsylvania Coalition developed 20-, 30-, and 60-second television PSAs which were produced with Ellen Casey, the Governor's wife, and distributed to local television stations. An additional radio PSA was also developed and made available in each of the local areas where local coalitions had been formed.

The Kentucky project, conducting major activities in video materials development, created a 30-minute series—"Making Literacy Work"—with associated print materials on fund-raising, recruitment, and evaluation as well as another 30-minute series—"Teach An Adult to Read"—with associated print materials on English as a Second Language, learning disabilities, and math skills.

The Mississippi Coalition was particularly pleased to report that it produced three 30-second videotape spots (directing listeners to the hotline) which received the Jim Duffy Award (in honor of Jim Duffy, President of Capital Cities/ABC Corporate Communications). The production was underwritten by South Central Bell and in-kind contributions from the Jackson Ad Club.

B. Recruitment and Training

The Gannett Foundation was very interested in student recruitment and the recruitment and training of tutors and/or trainers (and/or teachers) as the most fundamental and important ways to increase the size and effectiveness of adult literacy programs and systems. As listed in both Year 1 and Year 2 RFPs, the first two suggested "appropriate activities" were increasing the number of adult nonreaders in tutoring programs and increasing the number of volunteer tutors. As a consequence, only two of the projects (Illinois and New York) did not directly include significant recruitment and training components. Reflective of perceived needs, in some of the states, efforts were more heavily targeted to student recruitment than to tutor recruitment; in other states, the opposite was true. A relatively small number of states (e.g., Alaska, Minnesota, and Indiana) emphasized "train the trainer" models and efforts (beyond the convening of conferences attended by provider agency representatives).

1. Students

The projects used several relatively standard outreach strategies to increase the number of adult students. Popular efforts included some of the activities described above (e.g., public awareness activities, hotlines, print materials, and radio and television announcements) associated with information and referral, as well as special events, media campaigns, and celebrity endorsements. Some particularly aggressive and/or innovative efforts activities are described below.

The Minnesota project (MALC) regarded its public awareness and student recruitment efforts as among its most successful activities. Particularly determined to recruit students, MALC made use of staff resources as well as donated services to develop a comprehensive approach. Its activities included developing 30- and 60-second radio PSAs, as well as a 30-second TV commercial, and distributing Basic Skills Hotline posters and informational print materials directly through various human services agencies (e.g., at welfare offices). For example, student recruitment materials were distributed through mailings with unemployment compensation checks and medical assistance payments.

A year after launching their statewide campaign, MALC convened focus groups and sent surveys to literacy providers to evaluate the effectiveness and clarity of the messages that were being used in the campaign. After reviewing the data, a new recruitment campaign was developed.

GED-on-TV was yet another interesting outreach component of MALC. (This activity was not directly funded by the Gannett Foundation.) GED-on-TV is a 44-part educational series, produced by Kentucky Educational Television, for adults preparing to take the GED test for high school equivalency certificates. In 1987, MALC and two other Minnesota groups secured funding to purchase statewide broadcast rights for the series and to purchase air time on all six public television stations serving Minnesota. It also developed and produced promotional materials and publicity for the series, and through its Basic Skills Hotline, provided information and referral services linking viewers with adult education programs and GED testing sites. In January 1988, the GED-on-TV Task Force became operational on all six public television stations. Eventually, legislative funds were appropriated to continue the broadcasts. VCR tapes of the series have been made available to libraries statewide, and free workbooks were offered to literacy programs.

The Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy (WACAL), which had high expectations for bringing new adult learners into the system, identified as a major objective in its Year 1 proposal the recruitment and referral of 1,500 potential students to appropriate literacy services within the year. A major component of the strategy was the toll-free, statewide hotline. A procedure to ensure successful referral was established, including the recording of referral into a database, follow-up procedures, and the development of a procedures manual. When the ratio of volunteers to students remained at about 2 to 1, staff focused more heavily on their student outreach plan, including the increased use of local radio and television PSAs directed at prospective adult learners. During the second year of the project, the number of prospective student calls gradually increased to the point where they ran almost even in number to the calls from prospective volunteers.

By agreement with the State Department of Social and Health Services (in exchange for the loan of office furniture and equipment), the WACAL Hotline collected information on the employment status and educational background of prospective student callers, Early data indicated that the majority of those calling for help were native English speakers who were employed and had more than an eighth grade education. The Hotline also kept track of the source of calls.

Although not a direct recruitment or training strategy, an initiative developed with Year 1 residual grant funds by New York State was designed to enhance the visibility and status of student learners. The project sponsored the "Learners Take Action Mini-Grant Competition" to support student workshop presentations at the Commission on Adult Basic Education/New York State Association for Continuing Community Education 1990 Annual Conference. A State Literacy Council committee developed the competition rules and designed, disseminated, and judged the submissions. Although the response time frame was short, 25 applications were received. The committee chose eight winners who subsequently made their presentations at the annual conference. A 15-page booklet entitled "Learners Take Action: Ways in Which New York State Learners are Involved in their Literacy Programs" was developed and distributed.

Yet another example of a state's effort to enhance the visibility and prestige of students was that of the Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition (IALC), the first Adult Literacy Student Congress, which took place at the November 1988 Conference on Literacy Instruction. Forty adults attended the Congress which provided an opportunity for adult learners from across the state to express their views on literacy instruction. Based on their experiences with adult literacy programs, they identified 19 recommendations to offer top policy makers and program planners. The IALC subsequently voted to include several of the recommendations in their plans for future Coalition activities. Since some to the recommendations fell outside of the Coalition's literacy efforts, copies were sent to all local literacy groups in the state, to other states, and to state legislators.

The IALC was committed to future statewide student congress activities. At the time of the site visit, Coalition staff indicated their strong endorsement for the Student Congress concept, stating "It has been the most powerful activity Indiana has conducted to date. It has had more impact on student involvement than we would have imagined."

Alaska also developed a student literacy congress. While not a part of the project's stated goals, this initiative developed during the second year of project activity. The Coalition's Steering Committee members made a recommendation to sponsor a student from each of the five major population centers to attend the First Alaska Student Literacy Congress in Anchorage in October 1989. The assembly formulated a mission statement and discussed issues. The design for the Congress came from the National Student Congress in Washington, held in September 1989, and from successful meetings which had taken place in states such as Indiana. Correspondence from the Coalition Executive Director, subsequent to the site visit, indicated that a second Alaska Student Literacy Congress was held in October 1990. A committee of students formed from the first congress organized the event, which provided a way for adult literacy students to come together for support. The turnout was "small (10) but enthusiastic."

The Nevada Literacy Coalition (NLC) sponsored an essay writing contest for adult learners. Winning stories were collected, and subsequently disseminated, in a publication entitled, "What Learning to Read Means To Me." The stories were also featured in the Nevada Statewide Literacy Conference held in February 1988.

An interesting effort was made by the Connecticut project, Literacy Improvement Needs Collaboration (LINC), to increase the number of Bridgeport black urban adults participating in literacy programs. This was one of two Literacy Challenge projects that focused solely within a city (the other being Providence, Rhode Island), although the intention was to replicate the initiative in other cities throughout the state if it were successful. The LINC project explored whether, by the infusion of minorities into the instructional process, more blacks could be enticed into and remain in literacy programs as learners and as volunteers. At the heart of the effort was the belief that adults previously unreached by recruitment techniques would respond if recruitment efforts were aptly community-based. Specifically, the project worked closely with an alliance of black churches (22 participated) to recruit students, tutors, and "Literacy Assistants."

Location of the project in Bridgeport (the state's largest city, and among the nation's poorest) reflected the intense need of the city for a literacy education program which could penetrate the black community. Out of a total population of 107,000 adults, approximately 30,000 were functionally illiterate. The existing literacy coalition concluded that illiteracy was concentrated primarily among the minority population and was accompanied by high rates of unemployment and poverty. In areas where most minorities resided, the unemployment rate exceeded 40 percent. Evidence indicated that despite the sizeable minority populations requiring literacy or basic skills education, the three existing major provider groups were not serving proportional numbers.

The Project Coordinator or (later) a "Literacy Assistant" began the LINC process by contacting the individual churches and then holding meetings to recruit students. The LINC Literacy Specialist then diagnosed student skill levels, using the assessment tools developed as part of the Connecticut Adult Performance Project, the statewide competency-based adult education initiative. The intent was to develop a consistent assessment process. Once diagnosed, the student was referred to an appropriate program and subsequently tracked to be sure he or she was receiving services. The system also intended to allow LINC workers to quickly identify students who had dropped out in order to contact them and attempt to keep them in the system. (More information on the LINC initiative is included in the section below on Special Populations.)

The Mississippi Literacy Coalition also was particularly concerned about the large number of students who were dropping out of programs at the level just below the fourth grade. Hence, one of their major goals was to increase the number of students and volunteers while reducing dropouts in the state. Their dropout prevention strategy, which focused on the role of the tutor, became known as the Tutor Intervention Model Program. (The model is discussed in more detail in the section below on Tutors).

2. Tutors

As in the student recruitment activities, the projects used some of the relatively standard outreach and referral efforts described above (radio and television PSAs, posters, hotlines, special events, campaigns, contests, etc.) and various strategies to increase the number of volunteer tutors within their systems. These strategies frequently included local and regional workshops.

In Puerto Rico, the model for literacy instruction is that of professional teachers training volunteer tutors. This Gannett Foundation project focused heavily on the recruitment and training of tutors. The intent was a comprehensive, interdisciplinary, volunteer literacy program that would offer reading assistance and instruction to adult illiterates and out-of-school youth.

Funded for two years, the project was conducted in two regional areas. In Year 1, a model program was developed in Arecibo, a rural, mountainous, coastal district with the lowest average educational level and the highest percentage of illiteracy; in Year 2, the model was replicated on a full-scale basis in Caguas, an inland, largely rural, mountainous district with the second highest rate of illiteracy. In both of these areas, illiteracy rates were roughly twice that of urban areas. Tutors came from a wide variety of fields, including nurses, teachers, ministers, representatives from government and private agencies, and general citizens. This program also recruited and trained high school students as tutors. In fact, numerous activities were conducted to recruit tutors, including oral presentations by project staff to civic organizations, high schools, community colleges, clubs, churches, television, and radio audiences.

The tutor training materials used by the project emphasized the relevance of materials to the students' lives. Beginning with materials developed by the Educational Extension Area of the Department of Education of Puerto Rico, all tutor materials were oriented toward current events, consumer information, health, and other subjects of interest to the students. Project staff visited each of the Reading Centers to get input for production and revision of curriculum materials in accordance with each particular Center's needs. In addition to being highly reflective of student interests and concerns, all of the materials developed by the Puerto Rico project were also made available in Spanish.

The actual training of the tutors was provided by teachers, counselors, and resource people assembled by the project staff. (There were seven full-time teachers, and eight academic itinerant teachers at the regional level; funds from the Department of Education supplemented the project's activities.) Among other tasks, these fully certified teachers traveled from location to location in order to train the tutors and to provide ongoing technical assistance, support, and encouragement. Classes were offered at community centers, students' homes, tutors' homes, homes for the elderly, community centers, churches, and private and public institutions.

The teaching method was primarily a laboratory experience, using as many practical activities as possible, including mini-lectures, simulations, role playing, problem solving, and audiovisual kits. The subsequent activities of the teachers were wide ranging, including frequent site visits, curriculum modifications, and individualized technical assistance.

Tutors participating in the program with more than 100 hours of work received certificates of recognition which were presented at the end of each semester during graduation exercises by a Department of Education official. Newspaper releases were sent to the local papers publicizing this activity with photographs and names of individuals receiving recognition. The high school students serving as tutors were given a half credit for 60 hours of tutoring.

This project far exceeded its original goals in recruiting tutors. Rather than the proposed 65 new tutors, project activities produced 509 new tutors. Adding to this remarkable success was the fact that Puerto Rico does not have a long-established tradition of volunteerism. Many of the volunteer tutors and teachers indicated that this was their first volunteer experience. Assistant Secretary of Education Jose Rivers commented, "In Puerto Rico, the use of volunteers is not at all common. We had to change attitudes and motivate people."

Since it was the intent of the Nevada project to strengthen literacy activity through qualified tutor training and capacity-building workshops for literacy programs and volunteers, the Nevada Literacy Coalition also focused considerable energies on tutor activities. Training was provided in urban areas, which were dependent on volunteer trainers, and in rural areas where little training was currently available. In the first two years, the Director provided on-site consulting to programs in Reno and Las Vegas and coordinated with the Office of Volunteerism to run a series of workshops across the state. These regional meetings and workshops (e.g., "Literacy Programs: How to Get Involved") took place in cooperation with Agricultural Education and Communications, Nevada Cooperative Extension, University of Nevada-Reno.

The training was coordinated through a Director/Trainer who also developed a statewide training pool of skilled instructors including professionals from the University of Nevada, as well as competent regional and local instructors. Successfully illustrating this initiative, the Northern Nevada Literacy Council took over the provision of training on a regular basis to several rural locations. This effort, along with existing literacy activities, was publicized via targeted promotional campaigns to increase the numbers of students and tutors involved.

Tutoring materials and information packets, as well as resource guides and a bibliography of recommended materials for discrete reading levels, were developed through the collaboration of literacy workers, the university system, and libraries; and subsequently provided to volunteers and students involved in literacy programs. The Coalition sought to identify and disseminate tutor training methods that increase learning and decrease long-range time commitments of tutors and students; to provide models for small group tutoring and for transitions from intensive one-on-one tutoring to small group or classroom settings; and to provide quality certification for tutor trainers in a time- efficient manner.

In its third year, the Coalition produced its manual on volunteer management, entitled Volunteer Development: Strengthening Your Literacy Program; a collection of stories written at a new adult learner reading level entitled Stories and More: Nevada History for New Readers; and What Learning Means To Me, contest essays from the Statewide Literacy Conference writing contest. This collection was offered as a tutoring tool of interest to tutors in Nevada in rural literacy and to other programs nationwide.

Moreover, the Nevada Literacy Coalition made efforts to recruit tutors from sectors not often pursued: prison inmates, male tutors from male-oriented service organizations and male-dominant industries, and populations such as disabled veterans.

Tutors were a primary focus of the Mississippi Literacy Coalition as they sought to increase the number of students as well as the number of tutors (through typical activities such as a toll-free hotline, television PSAs, a statewide conference, etc.). An interesting component of this Coalition's activities was their efforts to reduce the number of student dropouts occurring in literacy programs: according to the proposal, approximately 50 percent of the students who had completed Laubach programs subsequently dropped out of further educational assistance because they were unable to make the transition to GED-level reading. To this end, the Coalition created the "tutor intervention model program," designed to facilitate the transition to GED or ABE classes for those adults who wanted to go on but who still required direct assistance.

The Gannett Foundation was very interested in knowing more about attrition problems from the perspective of the student. In February 1988, Christy Bulkeley stated: "A study of adult dropouts in Mississippi will help fight illiteracy in other states. Adult learning is such a long and tedious problem. After a couple of years, the motivation and the attention of the students are hard to maintain. The turnover of learners and tutors is a problem everywhere."

Instructors/tutors participated in an in-service training session before beginning the program. Training sessions were designed around the experience of the instructors and tutors. Information from the Mississippi Handbook for Adult Education Programs was used in planning for instructor training in working with special needs adults, methods of teaching adult learners, initial class meetings, student learning levels, student conferences, and student retention. "Adult Education Teacher Orientation," a teacher training video, was also used as a basis for in-service training.

The Coalition developed the model program at three sites: Jackson (representative of city schools), Rankin County (representative of country schools), and Meridian Community College (representative of community colleges). These districts were chosen because of their respective area's large number of functionally illiterate adults and the available resources and services to assist in developing an effective program. All three districts had very strong, active programs in vocational education, adult basic education, GED preparation, and literacy programs and activities. The students reflected characteristics associated with dropping out, such as inability to read beyond the fourth grade level, requiring direct assistance to handle adult education for GED preparation classes; imperfect mastery of decoding skills; limited reading vocabularies; and a limited fund of general knowledge, painful self-consciousness about their inability to read, and a feeling of more security with a tutor.

The model program's three-month curriculum focused on coping skills which could be applied to the home, workplace or classroom as the learner moved forward: getting a job, functional reading, reading signs, shopping for food, balancing a budget, using a checking account, and obtaining loans and credit. Instructors supplemented materials with items of local interest or additional material inclined to individual students' needs.

The tutor intervention program was measured by the following criteria: student progress to higher reading levels; duration of participation by both students and tutors; an independent evaluation conducted by an outside party; initial and re-test scores on the Coping Skills Inventory; and individual learner evaluations.

An outside, independent evaluation report was prepared by Dr. William Hetrick from the University of Southern Mississippi. (More detail on the methodology of the evaluation is included in Section D, Evaluations, below.) The Evaluation Report concluded: "The program has excellent potential to make a significant difference in reducing the high dropout rate among those students completing Laubach as they go on to the ABE or GED courses." Nevertheless, the Report commented that the lack of baseline data made it impossible to determine the program's effectiveness or ineffectiveness. It recommended that appropriate data be collected—and recording procedures be developed and conducted—to show the program's effectiveness.

An increased retention rate of 30 percent was the goal of the tutor intervention program. According to staff, this goal was met; in subsequent correspondence, staff also indicated that it was easy to keep track of the 10 students in the original start-up class, both in terms of their life coping skills as well as in their tutor learning classes. However, as in other situations, little concrete data were collected and maintained to document the results.

As described above in the section on Students, the Connecticut LINC project attempted to use an innovative relationship with the Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance (IMA), an alliance of black churches, to recruit students as well as tutors and "Literacy Assistants" from minority communities. This initiative reflected the extraordinary levels of illiteracy and unemployment in Bridgeport, the state's largest city and one of the poorest cities in the country.

The project aimed to recruit at least 50 literacy assistants to tutor LINC students directly in reading or basic skills; provide additional one-on-one support instruction to students in basic skills classes in public adult education programs or community-based programs; and/or assist outreach activities to recruit students or locate additional support services and educational programs for students. LINC asked the literacy assistants to contribute about three hours weekly to the project. The expectation was that most of the literacy assistants would emerge initially from the congregations of the IMA. Participation in an introductory training program was required. The project's Literacy Specialist supervised the training.

The literacy assistants received no payment for their actual services, although their training and transportation costs were covered. LINC also sponsored a series of recognition activities to acknowledge and publicize literacy assistant contributions, including certificates of achievement, a city-wide billboard campaign, banquets, and announcements in the media.

In Alabama, the Literacy Coalition was established as a result of the Gannett Literacy Challenge grants program, and most of its activities were embryonic and general in nature. A special program was created, however, to offer support to volunteer tutors. The Tutor of the Month Program created opportunities to single out and recognize outstanding tutor efforts. A certificate was awarded to the individual; thanks and recognition were included in the monthly newsletter ("Literacy Connection"); and a press release and article were sent to the tutor's local newspaper, library, and Chamber of Commerce. (A similar "Learner of the Month" award was given to exemplary students.)

The Delaware project (DCL) also focused on volunteer tutors. Although a number of programs were in place which used volunteers to train adults in literacy, there was a perceived need for increased collaboration and expertise in volunteer program management. As a result, in 1988, the Coalition convened the Volunteer Initiative Conference, with eight different organizations and agencies in attendance, to form partnerships in the use of volunteers. New partnerships developed between the Delaware Correctional Institution/Laubach Volunteers, Appoquinimink ABE/Laubach Volunteers, Christina ABE/Wilmington Volunteers, and Kent Vocational Technical/Laubach Literacy Tutors. Although the DCL final report indicated that these collaborative efforts increased services, no firm figures were cited.

The recruitment and referral of 1,500 volunteers to support literacy efforts was a major goal of the Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy (WACAL) during both of its years of Gannett Foundation activity. As in other states, WACAL relied heavily on public awareness efforts and its Literacy Hotline to attract and then direct volunteers to the closest and/or most appropriate local service provider. Follow-up procedures were developed and utilized. The Coalition conducted a telephone survey in February 1989 to determine, among other things, why a large group (52 percent) of those who contacted the Hotline (as potential volunteers) did not subsequently become involved with a literacy program. Lack of time and conflict with work were cited as major deterrents to participation.

3. Trainers and Teachers

Most of the projects focused at least some of their efforts on the recruitment and training of tutors. (See Table 4.) Few, however, targeted significant efforts toward training of trainers and/or teachers (with the caveat that several states convened conferences at which providers, including trainers and teachers, received various forms of technical assistance and/or training). The training of trainers and teachers can be a cost-effective "empowerment" strategy through which localities can develop the capacity to conduct their own training rather than having to rely on state trainers.

The training of trainers was a major goal of the Alaska Literacy Coalition. The project proposed to provide regional Training of Trainers (TOT) workshops in Fairbanks, Anchorage, and Juneau by Laubach, Literacy Volunteers of America, and the Alaska Adult Education Staff Development Program. Alaska already had a model adult education-teacher training-staff development program in place, delivering three days of training to instructors and directors in each of the 16 regional adult education programs throughout the state. The Coalition Steering Committee set up this same three-day training structure and then modified it to suit the needs of each major region. The three-day program featured one day on Laubach methods, one day on adult learning and instructional methods, and one day on its Parents and Tots Program. (See below, Section E-5, Family Literacy, for more information on the Parents and Tots Program.) After the workshops, participants were able to obtain technical assistance from the Coalition through the statewide 800 number donated by Alascom.

Staff developed a follow-up process for "tracking" the trainers and tutors who participated in the workshops. They kept in touch with them at least four times each year through newsletters and telephone calls. The Coalition supplied materials and information on both routine and episodic bases.

The TOT workshops primarily trained trainers but also trained tutors, particularly in the second year. The original plan was to train 45 trainers, but additional TOTs were conducted, including three in correctional facilities and others in previous unserved geographic areas. By December 1988, 78 trainers and approximately 195 tutors had completed the TOT workshops. Unfortunately, according to the Coalition staff, those individuals from the "most-in-need" areas had the hardest time sustaining community involvement.

One of the major organizations in the Minnesota Coalition, the Technology for Literacy Center, used computer technology to help adults improve their reading, writing, and math skills. Using a training design which was developed by TLC staff, as well as a needs assessment and survey data, technology workshops were held to develop four regional networks. Teachers were primary targets for the training in the use of technology in literacy instruction.

In the second year of the project, using an "each one teach one" model, additional workshops were held, often conducted by the individuals trained during the initial year of training. Staff concluded that a total of approximately 580 teachers were trained in technology. Use of Technology: Minnesota's Programs, a final report, was distributed in late 1990.

Like others, the Mississippi Literacy Coalition sought to help local literacy providers respond to the anticipated increase in demand for services by enhancing their skills in local organizational development and service provider training. Activities associated with the local development initiative included (1) a "train-the-trainer model" session and subsequent support services for interagency regional training teams, representing five geographic regions (who would, in turn, conduct training sessions in their respective regions); and (2) the conduct of five regional conferences for literacy program coordinators and volunteer tutors. General activities included support for the establishment of new coalitions and for strengthening existing local literacy coalitions; support for such coalitions in developing clearinghouse functions and public awareness campaigns; and the encouragement of networking among and between local literacy coalitions and programs.

In October and November 1988, five regional, one-day workshops were conducted, attended by 256 people. After attending a workshop, literacy providers were asked to hold a session locally describing what they had learned. No information was systemically collected to determine if they actually did that.

Developing strategies for increasing the numbers and effectiveness of trained volunteer literacy tutors throughout the state was a major goal of the Oregon Literacy Connection (OLC). Stating that the national awareness campaign, the statewide PLUS activities, and the expansion of literacy training sites to local public libraries had created a pool of potential volunteers to help with training needs in their communities, the original OLC proposal writers proposed a set of technical assistance activities targeted toward tutor training, support, and retention.

These activities included revision and dissemination of a tutor training kit; development of assessment and instructional strategies; creation of a database of instructional strategies; establishment of a statewide clearinghouse of tutor training resources; and distribution of a quarterly newsletter.

To create the tutor training manual, the staff and the Coalition's Task Force decided to build upon existing training materials. An extensive manual had already been drafted under 310 Special Projects monies by a group of community college ABE trainers. That manual was edited and revised for use as the statewide tutor training resource.

The resulting Tutor Training Guide is a self-paced training manual in a looseleaf notebook format with very specific instructions and tips for training tutors. Several hundred pages long, it is divided into eight discrete modules that can accommodate diverse training needs depending on time and resources and the background of volunteer tutors. For example, since many volunteer tutors have teaching experience, some of the chapters on instructional technique can be eliminated while those dealing with the need to treat adult learners as peers can be emphasized. The Guide also contains a plan for studying and assessing the literacy needs of the local community.

After the Tutor Training Guide was developed, local volunteer programs were asked to designate a person to act as the local "Tutor Trainer," to be trained during the annual conference, held in September 1988. The Guide was the focus of the September conference. For example, several sessions were held on how to use the Guide in the best interests of the tutors in remote areas of the state. Approximately 25 Tutor Trainers and 25 local program managers attended the training; the conference participants evaluated their experience and made recommendations about the kinds of information they should be keeping as a matter of course in tutoring situations. Follow-up technical assistance was made available to the learners and the volunteer tutors. (After the grant period these technical assistance activities were to be continued as part of the ABE technical assistance program provided by Oregon State University.)

The Tutor Trainers themselves also distributed the Tutor Training Guides along with evaluation sheets for trainers to fill out so that data could be collected from the field for revisions of materials. In addition, the Tutor Training Guides were distributed at the national COABE conference in June 1988.

According to project staff, the Manual helped increase discussion and build a consensus among programs with differing philosophies. Nevertheless, there were conflicting perceptions about the utility and value of the training manual. Most Task Force members felt that there was a need for improved and more standardized tutor training materials—and in fact many noted the development of the modules as a major project accomplishment—but several doubted the expenditure of so many resources on this product. Some programs found the modules extremely useful; others were not so positive. Further, staff felt that the field testing and evaluation of the modules were not so carefully designed as they should have been and that future applications of the modules in the field must include consistent, written evaluations by the users. In any case, the training modules were an ambitious undertaking as they include a vast body of information and training techniques.

During the first two years of the Nevada Literacy Coalition (NLC) activities, the Coalition produced On the Hurricane Deck of a Mule, a manual on the use of oral history as an instructional tool. Dr. Donald Bear, author of the manual, gave two presentations—one for tutors, and one for teachers and trainers of tutors—at the Statewide Literacy Conference in February 1988. The presentations were also videotaped as part of a teaching module to be made available to rural programs for in-service education programming.

C. Resource and System Expansion

Although almost all of the projects involved, in a generic sense, efforts to expand their literacy systems and available resources, several specific examples bear comment. Planning conferences, statewide plans, needs assessments, and field surveys frequently laid the groundwork for expansion efforts. Typical expansion activities included the provision of technical assistance, development of local and regional entities (task forces, caucuses and coalitions), creation of information and reporting enhancements, and efforts to impact public policy.

In some instances, systemic expansion was accomplished by bringing into the system groups of adult learners who had previously been underserved. An example was Minnesota's focus on learning disabled adults. MALC's efforts resulted not only in the infusion of new students but also an increase in the number of specialized tutors knowledgeable about this population and the development and dissemination of specialized instruction materials.

The California project (CAL) engaged in a somewhat unusual effort to expand the literacy system by reaching out to groups with the potential to increase referrals to adult literacy programs. Their strategy was endorsed by the national, black Assault on Illiteracy Program. Using an expanded directory of literacy providers, several regional hotlines, and the provision of training for making appropriate referrals to literacy programs, CAL targeted agencies (both public and private) with extensive contacts with hard-to-reach populations. Examples were county welfare and probation offices, outpatient health care offices, family planning agencies, United Way agencies, and the Employment Development Department. The purposes of the training were to (1) increase the number of referrals; (2) improve the skills of other agency personnel in identifying potential adult learners and making referrals; (3) increase recruitment of hard-to-reach populations; (4) permit service providers to redirect resources from recruitment to direct service; and (5) increase the efficiency of referring agencies by giving them a way to respond to illiterate adults.

Using materials developed by SRA Associates, eight regional training workshops were conducted, attracting more than 600 representatives of literacy service agencies and potential referral agencies. Popular topics included serving clients with special needs and recruiting hard-to-reach students.

A second set of workshops focused specifically on those agencies that could play a referral role. Significantly, as stated by staff, despite a high level of awareness of adult illiteracy issues, most government and social service agencies indicated that they were not organized as if they really believed their clients had difficulty reading. That is, workshop participants were aware that everything from signs and intake procedures to educational materials and client treatment procedures often assumed levels of literacy that agency staff knew many of their clients lacked. There was substantial interest in this component of the project; 718 participants attended the 16 provider and provider/referrer workshops.

Yet another strategy for system expansion were various efforts to introduce computer technology. Such efforts are discussed in more detail below in Section E-2, Computer Technology. Through the use of various technologies, projects hoped to increase options available to individual students and volunteer tutors (and therefore, theoretically, increase their numbers).

1. Technical Assistance

As a state with its coalition beginning "from scratch," the Nevada Coalition comprehensively completed a statewide literacy needs assessment, collecting information and statistics on literacy programs in Nevada to show where intensive literacy efforts were indicated. A related objective was to develop a system of accountability for gathering information and disseminating it to key groups and individuals.

The Coalition contracted with the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) to conduct the needs assessment. The UNR Reading Center collected data, and produced an Executive Summary draft statement and a final report entitled Project TACL: A Team Approach to Community Literacy. The findings focused on issues such as the number of adults in Nevada who were functionally illiterate; the size of the existing literacy system and its ability to meet the needs of the illiterate; the problems that illiteracy were creating in the workplace; and the difficulty in evaluating the effectiveness of literacy programs in Nevada (or anywhere else). As stated in the final report:

> Hard data on reading gains, for example, are not generally available. Literacy programs that returned surveys typically report effectiveness in terms of the adult students gaining confidence in themselves and their reading skills. These are tremendously important outcomes, but they do not give a full picture of program effectiveness. . . . The data for adults in literacy programs is mainly anecdotal. Adult literacy programs, with the diverse needs of students and open entry/exit enrollment, do not have the structure found in school programs.

In reporting the "greatest need" perceived by the respondents, "more effective ways to reach adult illiterates" was ranked highest, followed by additional training for volunteers (reported primarily by volunteer groups), additional professional teachers (reported primarily by public-supported programs), and additional volunteers. Other needs mentioned included improved administrative procedures, stable funding, computer-assisted instruction, and program improvements which would result in better retention of students.

In addition to the needs assessment conducted by the UNR Reading Center, a Volunteer Management Project Survey was administered to literacy managers of 21 programs in the spring of 1989. (Seven of the recommendations in the needs assessment report were related to volunteer and program management issues.) Information collected from these programs—on priority topics and existing resources and needs—was used to develop the "how to" manual entitled Volunteer Development: Strengthening Your Literacy Program. Answers were also used to identify subjects subsequently emphasized in the training workshops conducted in Year 3 (Nevada was the only project funded for three years). Collaborative volunteer management and program development activities were conducted with the Nevada Office of Volunteerism, and included regional meetings and the sharing of materials.

As reported in its Bonus Grant application, the Coalition provided technical assistance in management and program development to eight programs in existence at the inception of the Coalition and to one local literacy coalition formed in the fall of 1988. The Coalition further reported that they had provided technical assistance enabling the development of 25 new literacy programs statewide and two new local coalitions. This assistance continued as these new programs needed management support to ensure continued development.

In its third year of activity the NLC provided training sessions, using the Volunteer Development Manual, to literacy coalitions, local literacy programs, five libraries, and three statewide and/or national conferences.

The Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition (IALC) included several unusual elements of technical assistance support (e.g., extensive, highly coordinated use of VISTA Volunteers, discussed in the next section on the development of local and regional caucuses, task forces, and coalitions). A very significant component of the project was the use of a "Resource Cadre."

The IALC Resource Cadre members were individuals already recognized within the state as "experts" in various aspects of adult literacy. Their specialities included knowledge about teaching methods, materials, research, learning disabilities, and needs assessment. The groundwork for the Resource Cadre was already in place at the start of the Gannett Foundation grant, in that a state Literacy Clearinghouse was functioning as a joint effort of the IALC, the Department of Education, the Adult Education Resource Center, and Ball State University. This Clearinghouse maintained profiles of available literacy resource persons. Hence, the IALC was able to build upon an existing data bank.

The Coalition created a relatively formal process for becoming part of the Resource Cadre. A survey was developed which listed many areas of expertise, ranging from topics such as reading instruction, to student motivation, to dislocated workers. In addition to supplying the above information, Resource Cadre members were asked to supply references and indicate the times they were available, fees charged, and their requirements for materials and equipment.

The Resource Cadre significantly expanded as the project progressed. In 1986, 60 topics, and only 30 or so individuals, were listed. By the end of the project, approximately 90 topics and 213 individuals were associated with the Cadre. The Resource Cadre data file was entered onto the Literacy Clearinghouse computer late in the project. Once computerized, staff tracked the use of the Cadre, reporting that between January and March, VISTA Volunteers contacted Cadre members directly 68 times; referred someone from the Cadre to a local group 39 times; and recommended 29 times that someone contact the Clearinghouse for a Cadre referral.

In correspondence submitted after the end of the project and the site visit, IALC staff reported that the Resource Cadre continues to be maintained in its computerized format. The existing topics and resource persons are now categorized under six basic types of assistance, including a Speakers' Bureau (another relatively new literacy initiative).

Although it is obvious that the existence of an updated, computerized listing of available expertise is a very valuable resource, the IALC had aspirations for the Resource Cadre which proved too difficult to accomplish. It was originally hoped that a quality control system could be put in place; that is, that a relatively elaborate process could be established so that services provided by Cadre members would be formally evaluated in terms of quality and cost, and that such information would subsequently be available for those seeking the services of a Cadre member. Initial "intake information" from those included on the Cadre list was intended to be used for this purpose. The IALC went so far as to discuss applying existing state guidelines for fee structuring. Lacking any real authority to regulate fees, however, staff indicated that they eventually "got out of the business," leaving any discussion or decision about payment to the inquirer and the Cadre member. Hence, the fees charged by the consultants in the Resource Cadre are self-identified and negotiated by the type of service.

The Pennsylvania State Coalition for Adult Literacy (PSCAL) also established a computerized resource cadre, containing approximately 250 names of individuals considered to be literacy experts. The purpose of the resource file was to encourage the delivery of technical assistance across program types and to develop a greater understanding of others' programs. As stated in an initial survey sent to all program providers, "this offers an opportunity for your staff to share their expertise with others in the field." The file could be accessed by mail or by phone. Sample topics included: needs assessments, tutor training, tutor recruitment, student intake, grantsmanship, legislative contacts, library programs, technology, special needs populations, business and industry associations, and record keeping. Unfortunately, PSCAL did not document the use or impact of this resource cadre.

The PSCAL created a special technical assistance cadre called "WorkTAP" (Workplace Literacy Technical Assistance Program), experienced in workforce education. WorkTAP consultants developed training materials (a manual and an accompanying videotape) and conducted technical assistance workshops for local coalitions. Data on numbers of people trained and numbers of local workplace programs that resulted were not kept. (See below, Section E-3, Workplace Literacy, for more information on the WorkTAP initiative.)

In addition to the technical assistance support for tutors which the Oregon Literacy Connection (OLC) project's Tutor Training Guide represented (discussed above), the OLC established a statewide clearinghouse of tutor training resources, including specialized personnel available to provide assistance in communities where resources were limited. At the end of the project, these materials were to become part of the ABE/ESL Materials Clearinghouse at Oregon State University. (The OLC was not intended to continue beyond the grant period.) A system of computerizing material was devised, and a clerk was trained to input information. All of the materials in the Clearinghouse were categorized and input by subject area, supplemental subject, title, author, and publisher. Materials were made available on loan to train tutors. Staff subsequently indicated that information on the holdings was not so widely disseminated as it could have been.

Yet another tutor-focused activity of the OLC included the development and dissemination of a quarterly newsletter. During the conduct of the first year of project activity, an administrative decision was made to combine the newsletter with that of the Oregon Adult Basic Education Newsletter, Intercom. The resultant document, Networks—Oregon Adult Education Newsletter, was intended to serve volunteer literacy tutors and tutor programs. The distribution of the newsletter was to be continued at the end of the grant period as part of the ABE staff development program at Oregon State University.

The most successful endeavor of the project, according to the final report, was the hiring of a Resource Specialist to receive incoming calls from both learners and tutors and make appropriate matches or referrals to other services. Using a computerized information and referral system, placements exceeded projections: for example, from June to November, 245 matches were made (120 had been projected). Ways were found to continue to fund the Resource Specialist's position for the second year through Portland Community College and the Oregon Litline Foundation.

The most comprehensive and targeted effort to develop and expand resources was conducted by the Illinois Literacy Resource Development Project (ILRDP). Leading in Year 2 to technical assistance, virtually all of the ILRDP's major activities, and the resultant products, were specifically constructed to expand resources. The Illinois literacy effort was a joint cooperative venture among the six major literacy organizations (three public and three private) in the state. It was the conclusion of this group of organizations, reflective of the extensive amount of literacy activity occurring in the state, that it was essential to begin a new phase of development which would ensure long-term growth. Key to this long-range growth was technical assistance to local literacy programs on how to develop public and private resources.

To develop the "tools" for this long-range stability, the ILRDP created four statewide task forces to address specific strategies for developing local resources. The task forces were composed of diverse local literacy providers (usually five), who were themselves members of different statewide networks, and resource "experts" (usually two) in the task force area. Each of these task forces eventually produced a manual, specifically targeted to one sector of resource development. The four Resource Development Task Forces and their manuals were as follows:

1. Marketing Contractual Literacy Services to Business. Activities of the Task Force included: Survey and list existing resources; develop processes to support literacy programs' to market an overall educational plan to management and to employees; develop strategies so that programs can easily access information about business and industry and their educational needs; and develop a sample proposal for presentation to business/industry for contracting services of local providers. The Task Force worked with two primary objectives: (1) Gather information on needs analyses, marketing strategies, sample proposals, curriculum development, task analyses, and statistical analyses of a workplace literacy program to compile into a manual; and (2) develop a matrix on how educators can better meet the needs of business.

   The Marketing Contractual Literacy Services to Business Manual contents are: Planning; Marketing; Needs Assessment; Recruitment; Curriculum Planning; Sample Contracts and Cost Calculation; Evaluation; Bibliographies; Resource People; and Appendices.

2. Increasing Donations from Individuals. Activities of the Task Force included: Review possible strategies (such as direct mail, benefits, sales) and select one or two to concentrate on; develop sample direct mail materials for different geographies and demographic populations within the state (rural, urban, small town, suburban); discuss organizational structures needed to support grassroots fundraising within programs, such as board development, fundraising committees, additional staffing, follow-up procedures, and fiscal agents. The Task Force worked with three primary objectives: (1) survey all literacy providers in the state on their fundraising activities and list the successes and failures; (2) develop a marketing strategy to sell a literacy program as a "product"; and (3) develop a training manual for literacy providers.

   The Increasing Individual Donations Manual contents are: Strategies; Descriptions of Fundraising Events; Resource People; Survey Results/Sample Survey; Annotated Bibliography; and Other Sources of Information. The American Cable Television System produced videotapes to accompany this manual.

3. Increasing Corporate/Foundation Support. Activities of the Task Force included: identify technical assistance and training needs of local literacy programs to enable them to attract corporate and foundations funding; create a list of potential technical assistance sources within the state; explore avenues for new and increased private support to supplement public funding currently available to programs; develop criteria for minimal internal programs structures necessary to pursue corporate funding; and survey corporate and foundation funders about areas of interest in and willingness to fund publicly-supported and other literacy programs. The Task Force concentrated on three primary objectives: (1) survey associations in Illinois to find out the main contact person, phone number, membership size, meeting dates, etc., and disseminate to providers; (2) develop strategies to educate corporation and foundation representatives about the problems of illiteracy; and (3) develop a manual with "tips" for approaching and selling a program to a foundation or corporation.

   The Increasing Corporate/Foundation Support Manual contents are: Define Your Goals, Assess Your Chances and Plan; Research and Identify Your Prospects; Research Your Prospects in Depth; Contact Your Perspective Donor; Write Your Formal Proposal; Follow-Up Your Proposal; Strategize Your Future, The First Year On; and Addendum.

4. Impacting Local Public Policy. Activities of the Task Force included: review local public policy issues identified by literacy programs as areas of concern; prepare model local policy statement in support of literacy efforts to test in selected areas; create local strategies for implementing needed policies; and develop a strategy for identifying natural allies for policy implementation at the local level. The Task Force worked on one primary objective: develop policy statements and strategies on ways literacy providers can affect local public policy to raise awareness about the problems of illiteracy, access money for literacy programs, and involve students in the functions of the programs.

   The Impacting Local Public Policy Manual contents are: Raising Public Awareness; Funding and Public Awareness; Adult Learners and Public Policy; The Political Structure in Illinois; The Public Voice; Resources; References and Bibliography; and Appendices.

These activities and products of the Illinois Coalition were leading toward the development, in the second year of the project, to a Statewide Implementation Task Force. The intent was to create statewide strategies for the support of local initiatives; develop a statewide plan for a more coordinated delivery system of technical assistance and training within the state; and determine how to most effectively continue the network of skilled resource people. This Task Force included representatives of the four strategic task forces plus individuals experienced in and active in developing statewide policy.

Key to their efforts was technical assistance in the four areas of resource development described above. The ILRDP created the Resource Development and Communication Center as the entity through which future technical assistance activities would occur. From the Center, "a menu of technical assistance at varying degrees of sophistication on how to access resources from the public and private sectors will be provided." It was agreed that the Center would serve anyone connected with adult literacy and not limit itself to service-specific types of providers. The staff and Board began the process of incorporation for the center and searching for long-term funding to support it. Correspondence from the Executive Director in late 1990 reported that the ILRDP has indeed become a 501(c)(3) with an expanded Board of Directors and widening activities in the areas of family literacy and workplace literacy.

The substantive content of technical assistance activities ranged from organizational management, fundraising, and administrative concerns, to issues such as specialized instructional approaches, targeted outreach strategies, and recruitment and retention methods.

In its second year of activity, the Nevada Literacy Coalition (NLC) began to provide in-depth technical assistance in program development to new and existing literacy programs. These activities, coordinated with the Nevada Office of Volunteerism, introduced program management methods from the volunteer sector. New tutor training methods (e.g., for small group tutoring, and for transitions from one-on-one tutoring to small group or classroom settings) were introduced. In its Bonus Grant proposal (subsequently funded), the Coalition's two primary goals both addressed program development: (1) to increase the management skills of volunteer literacy program coordinators, resulting in refined recruitment and increased retention of literacy volunteers and adult learners; and (2) to extend literacy coalition development among community organizations during the transition of the Nevada Literacy Coalition from Gannett Foundation funding to in-state public/private support, and resource development through training seminars and local coalition meetings.

To facilitate these goals, the Coalition developed and began disseminating a "how to" manual entitled Volunteer Development: Strengthening Your Literacy Program in late 1989. Technical assistance and training sessions on the use of the Manual were provided to literacy coalitions, local literacy programs, libraries, and at statewide conferences. Stories and More, a collection of short stories, was also distributed to a wide range of Nevada literacy providers as well as to the other Literacy Challenge grantees nationwide.

Similar to some other states, the Nevada Coalition developed a lending library of videotape and cassette tape programs for use in all literacy programs and especially rural programs which had less access to a pool of local resource people and programs.

Yet another example of aggressive efforts to provide technical assistance to local literacy providers was the Kentucky project's creation of a network of four regional Technical Assistance Groups (TAGs). Each group consisted of five individuals selected from exemplary community literacy programs. These groups were trained by a full-time, project-related, community organization advisor (hired by the Kentucky Literacy Commission) and were to remain in place permanently to assist local groups in program development, implementation, and ongoing program monitoring. These efforts were supplemented by the development and availability of two sets of 30-minute videos and accompanying print materials. The first, an organizationally-oriented series entitled "Making Literacy Work," contains three modules on Evaluation, Fundraising, and Recruitment and Retention. Gannett Foundation funds were used to expand the second series by three specialized modules: Mathematics, English as a Second Language, and Working with Individuals with Developmental Disabilities.

The 30-minute video program series, which was produced by the Kentucky Educational Television (KET), was intended to provide a permanent resource to community literacy groups. The Kentucky Department of Education, Division of Adult Education, developed the course content for the tutor-trainer, six-hour workshops in 15 area development districts. The Literacy Challenge grant project produced the Tutor-Training Resource Manual, written by Dr. Ruthann Phillips of the Kentucky Department of Education. Organized in a large 3-ring binder notebook, this manual is composed of abstracts of selected research and "how to" materials relevant to literacy instruction and tutor-training.

The provision of technical assistance to local literacy service providers was a major goal of the Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy (WACAL) in both Year 1 and Year 2. Citing increased public awareness and resultant service demands, WACAL intended to provide assistance to a minimum of 10 local volunteer providers. Others eventually included community colleges and vocational-technical ABE programs. The desire for help was greatest from those organizations that had recently expanded and had, for the first time, paid volunteer coordinators. Gannett Foundation funds allowed WACAL to serve a greater number of programs over a wider geographic area.

Technical assistance included topics such as training, fundraising, coalition building, planning, organizing, and volunteer management. As reported by staff, the Field Coordinator (hired by Washington Literacy) was able to visit more than 20 literacy programs, providing information and technical assistance to improve services within these programs. After the conclusion of the Gannett Foundation activities, technical assistance continued to be available via telephone and written correspondence. Securing and maintaining a stable base of financial support for this well-developed service delivery system remained problematic.

And finally, the provision of technical assistance, along with information and materials dissemination, and training coordination, was a major goal of the Alaska Literacy Coalition. Efforts were primarily targeted to volunteer tutors once they had been trained by their regional literacy trainer. A literacy newsletter, an 800 toll-free hotline, and program and services directory also facilitated these activities.

2. Development of Local and Regional Caucuses, Task Forces, and Coalitions

Learning to develop stable fiscal and program resources locally was regarded as critical throughout the country, and virtually all of the projects involved at least some efforts targeted at the local and/or regional level, with activities ranging from the informal convening of workshops and caucuses, to the forming of more formal task forces and coalitions. In some instances, however, these activities were major project initiatives.

A primary focus of the Indiana project was the development of local coalitions. In fact, the primary strategy used by the Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition (IALC) to affect literacy was to encourage and assist in developing local coalitions. The coalitions coordinated existing services, provided centralized information and referral, and identified and addressed service gaps. The goals of the project included the increase of local literacy coalitions from 28 at the start of the project to 35 (46 was the actual final number) by its conclusion.

To demonstrate that the local literacy coalition members were using the principles and practices advocated in project-provided training and technical assistance activities, it was expected that the coalitions would expand their resource base through local fundraising efforts; increase private sector representation; adopt a standardized data collection and reporting process (developed at the state level); and expand local public awareness efforts. In addition, it was hoped in the second year of the project that the local coalitions would participate in a certification process developed by the IALC.

Both before and during the Gannett Foundation grant period the IALC had considerable success in developing local coalitions. A resultant problem, however, was the constant influx of new people who had a great deal of enthusiasm but limited knowledge of how to develop their local organizations. There was also a need for follow-up assistance at various stages in a group's development and need for problem solving. Hence, a committee of the IALC, the Local Coalition Support Committee, developed the idea of using regionally-based advocates, i.e., experienced local coalition representatives, to assist other groups. This group, the "Regional Volunteer Network," was supplemented by members of the "Resource Cadre," individuals already identified in the state as having specialized skills and knowledge. Their specialities included teaching methods, materials, research, learning disabilities, and needs assessment. (More information on the Resource Cadre is included in Section C-1, Technical Assistance). These two groups and their efforts were major components of the Indiana Gannett Foundation project.

The strategy involved dividing the state into regions. The regional volunteers and Cadre members were oriented to Indiana's literacy network and their responsibilities. Subsequent coalition training focused on fundraising, accountability, private sector involvement, and public awareness. And finally, workshops within the regions were held to train new coalition representatives, replicate the state-level training, meet locally identified needs, and conduct tutor training within a regional area. Through these regional efforts the IALC expected to increase the number of coalitions, volunteer tutors, and learners.

Yet another special component of the Indiana project was the extensive, coordinated use of VISTA Volunteers within the framework of the regional volunteer network and Resource Cadre initiatives. The regional volunteers were, in fact, drawn primarily from VISTA Volunteers. This cooperative effort required the participation of the state's ACTION office. ACTION paid the subsistence allowance for the VISTA Volunteers, and Gannett Foundation funds paid for the Volunteers' travel and training. The Indiana Department of Education's Literacy Coordinator supervised the VISTA Volunteers, and a literacy provider organization within the assigned region provided local supervision. Eight full-time Volunteers were recruited to serve for one year each.

The VISTA Volunteers were recruited from the region of the state in which he or she would serve. The duties of the VISTA Volunteers were to work to increase the number of local literacy coalitions by helping to organize new coalitions; provide technical assistance and arrange for training for local literacy groups; provide requested assistance in developing literacy organizations; assess community interest in literacy programs; and track and report on tasks and progress. During the course of the Gannett Foundation project, several workshops were held to support the Volunteers and their regional efforts.

There were 46 local or regional coalitions by the end of the project. When Gannett Foundation funding ran out at the end of the second year, the Coalition received a $120,000 from ACTION to expand

and continue its VISTA project. This grant provided for 15 VISTA Volunteers to be placed around the state. Rather than dividing the state into even smaller regions, the new VISTA Volunteers were assigned to individual local coalitions to provide intensive assistance for one year per local coalition

As an example of local caucus efforts, the first of two central activities of the New York initiative was the convening of 11 regional caucuses (leading to the second major effort, a statewide convention). These regional areas were previously drawn when 11 television service areas and collaborative task forces were established in response to the public service campaign of Project Literacy U.S. (PLUS) in 1986. The task forces were outgrowths of well-established literacy coalitions. Each of the 11 regions was allocated $2,000 to cover the cost of planning and holding its one-day caucus, including printing, mailing, transportation, rentals, and food.

The intended outcomes of the local caucuses were (1) to create a mechanism through which teacher/tutors and learners could communicate with one another and with literacy policymakers in the state; and (2) to strengthen the ties among the diverse literacy providers in the state. Local caucus leaders believed that this process would lead to an annual series of caucuses, an annual state convention, and a biannual voter registration campaign aimed at nonreaders.

Separate teacher/tutor and learner sessions were held at each caucus in each of the 11 regions (13 caucuses in total, as two large regions split into two caucuses). The major focus was developing a list of needs and a list of successful practices and ideas for literacy students and programs. Discussions of voting and the 1988 Presidential elections were also paramount.

As one of its two major goals, the Pennsylvania State Coalition for Adult Literacy (PSCAL) sought to "strengthen statewide adult literacy efforts through coordinated technical assistance to direct service providers via coalitions," with associated objectives and activities such as: (1) strengthen existing local coalitions and establish at least six new local coalitions in areas of greatest need based on needs assessment results; (2) convene at least three regional workshops to enable local groups to design strategies for more effective utilization of local resources for fund development potential and for involvement with the private sector in adult literacy efforts; and (3) form a Local Coalition Support Committee of the State Coalition to identify persons to initiate local coalition building and to ensure that monies for adult literacy programming are channeled through local coalitions.

A unique component of PSCAL was the "seeding of local coalitions up front." ("Seeding" of local programs was also part of the New Mexico coalition and, to a lesser extent, the activities of the Oregon project.) The Gannett Foundation was interested in "whether such start-up grants help get them together faster and more effectively." During its second year, the PSCAL received $50,000, part of which was used to give technical assistance to those coalitions organized without seed monies as well as those started with assistance in the first year; additional local coalition grants were also made in the second year of the grant. According to the PSCAL, the very process of developing and submitting a proposal for a start-up grant brought together various sectors of the community in a mutual interest: to build community-wide strategies to promote and support local literacy efforts.

Once the State Coalition was established in April 1987, the Governing Board identified geographic areas without local coalitions; formulated a plan at the Adult Literacy Institute (Pennsylvania State University) for fostering the development of local coalitions; and created a Local Coalition Building Committee to implement the plan. The plan included offering a regional workshop and associated technical assistance to help local coalitions pose collaborative projects for funding from the grant award. To encourage collaboration, a minimum number of public and private sector representatives from a given area had to attend. Of the 14 potential local coalitions which attended the first-year workshop in October 1987, 12 subsequently applied for and received grants for their initiatives. Reflective of its political influence, the PSCAL arranged for Ellen Casey, Governor Robert Casey's wife, to attend the workshop to demonstrate the state's support of the Coalition and literacy efforts in general. The most difficult problem for the local groups seemed to be identifying the business and industry representative required by the Coalition.

In the following year, the PSCAL funded a total of 18 local coalitions, including the original 12 funded by the Gannett Foundation and 6 additional funded with proceeds from the Governor's "Pennsylvania Yes!" fundraiser. (At the time of the site visit, a total of 23 local coalitions had received funds of up to $5,000 from the Coalition.) As in the first year, technical assistance for responding to an RFP had been provided during the Local Literacy Coalitions Panel workshop at the Mid-Winter Adult Education Conference held in February 1989. Coalitions had been asked to include community representatives from agencies within state and local government; representatives from the leading businesses, labor, service organizations, educational institutions, and libraries; and all literacy providers.

Unfortunately, data on local coalition activities were limited, as, with the exception of financial reports from coalitions receiving seed monies, no systematic reporting mechanisms were required or used by the PSCAL. Anecdotal information could be gleaned from some specific local coalitions and from local newspapers, conference materials, and similar sources. Examples of the types of activities engaged in by the local coalitions included business breakfasts, development of radio and television PSA scripts, and various public awareness campaigns and events.

Other PSCAL efforts to support the local coalitions included establishing a hotline (later discontinued because of lack of use); updating an existing directory of service providers, including those engaged in workplace literacy activities; inserts for others' (local) newsletters; developing a computerized resource bank of people and organizations who were experts and able to provide technical assistance across program types; and providing technical assistance. These activities were centralized at the Adult Literacy Institute.

In addition, a specialized technical assistance cadre focused on workforce education called "WorkTAP" (Workplace Literacy Technical Assistance Program) was developed, which received 310 Special Projects funding from the Division of Adult Basic Education. This component of the PSCAL produced two major products: a workplace literacy training manual, Upgrading Basic Skills for the Workplace, and an accompanying videotape, "A Literate Workforce: Meeting the Needs." (See below, Section E-3, Workplace Literacy, for more information on WorkTAP.) With the availability of this funding, most of the technical assistance provided by the PSCAL focused on workforce literacy efforts and enabling local coalitions to assist employers. Records were scarce regarding the actual technical assistance activities.

The Tennessee Literacy Coalition (TLC) created mobile training teams to assist in developing local coalitions in the three major divisions of the state. The Tennessee project believed that the effective development of local literacy efforts in recruiting and retaining good volunteer tutors and program participants in need of literacy services should be the focal point in the design of successful literacy programs. Skill building in local organizational development and service provider training was considered essential to increasing the capacity of local programs to respond to the anticipated increase in demand for literacy services.

Under the leadership and direction of the TLC Oversight Committee, two major tasks were identified: (1) to provide support and technical assistance for the development of local literacy coalitions; and (2) to provide skill building opportunities for persons offering local literacy services. Subsequent activities included the establishment and training of the three interagency mobile training teams, which in turn conducted training sessions and provided technical assistance (in local coalition organizational development strategies) in their respective regions.

In retrospect, at the time of the site visit, TLC staff indicated that the mobile training teams did not work so well as they had initially hoped. Although the training itself seemed to have been successfully conducted, the Clearinghouse Coordinator speculated that many local providers wanted and used a wider variety of techniques and materials than just that provided in the curriculum (Laubach). The project added a librarian orientation component focusing on sensitizing librarians to the issues of illiteracy and to the availability of resources.

The TLC also supported the development of local coalitions through the creation of a clearinghouse, hotline support, print materials, and sharing of public awareness campaign activities. Three regional conferences, which were held for literacy program coordinators and volunteer tutors, focused on topics such as learning disabilities and adults; motivation and retention techniques; diagnosing and prescribing; and English as a Second Language. At one such conference, entitled "A New Dawn for Literacy Participants" held in March 1988 and featuring national authorities and successful program practitioners, approximately 400 individuals attended.

TLC staff conducted six regional one-day workshops for the purpose of giving intensive instruction on teaching basic literacy skills to groups of learners. These were attended by 215 individuals, with local literacy coordinators, ABE teachers or supervisors, librarians, VISTA volunteers, and JTPA counselors in attendance. Additional activities in the second year included a video-based tutor workshop, which again drew coordinators and tutor trainers from local programs, and representatives from regional libraries.

The New Mexico Coalition also sought to strengthen the state's overall literacy system by developing and enhancing local activities. Of particular interest was the Coalition's support and funding for pilot projects involving Hispanic and Indian communities. (See below Section E-1, Special Populations, for more information on this initiative.)

In addition to the activities conducted by the Oregon project (OLC), described above in Section B-2, Tutors, two other OLC activities targeted to the development and support of tutors and tutor efforts resulted in project documents targeted to the development of coalitions: (1) Coalition Planning Document, a guide with sections on forming and maintaining local coalitions, conducting a community needs assessment, a bibliography, and appendices; and (2) Training Effective Tutors, instructional plans and materials. The first of these, having to do with coalition building, increased in importance during the course of the first year of the project. Responding to decisions at the January 1988 quarterly Task Force meeting, project staff re-prioritized this activity. The Literacy Coordinator increased her time for building literacy coalitions from 20 percent of her time to 50 percent. In final reports from the OLC it was reported that, as a result of the project, 16 local literacy coalitions were formed.

3. Information and Reporting Enhancements

The development of information reporting capabilities was another component of system development in which the Gannett Foundation was particularly interested. The Foundation hoped that the projects would develop uniform reporting systems with information that could be compared. Of particular concern was the perception that volunteer-based organizations have not been diligent in either record keeping or in follow-up activities, but rather have seen these activities as diversions from the real "mission" of adult literacy.

What in fact occurred for the most part was that "pieces" of information were established, primarily through data collected by the hotlines (see above Section A, Information and Referral) and through needs assessments. Efforts to establish statewide, comprehensive data collection systems were few, and mostly frustrated. The lack of a common basis for reporting data such as student participation and progress, as well as volunteer and paid staff characteristics, made even within-state comparisons impossible in most cases.

The Indiana Coalition proposed to develop a standardized data collection and reporting process which it hoped local literacy coalition members would use. In addition, the project proposed in its second year to create a certification process to improve local coalition accountability. With regard to the former, the model evaluation and data collection system, as described in the initial proposal to the Gannett Foundation, were not developed. They were placed on the back burner when a subcommittee of the Provider Network decided that the Division of the Budget and key legislators would not fund adult services without such information immediately available. As a result, Governor Orr created a high level, state agency task force to quickly develop the system. In fact, shortly thereafter, there was a change in leadership, and the system was never developed despite the need for a common data base. With regard to the certification process, although a good deal of work was devoted to its development, staff concluded during the site visit that since the project had no "teeth" to mandate participation in the certification process and there was no perceived inherent value to the provider agencies whom they hoped to attract for certification, they had been unable to achieve this objective.

The New Mexico Coalition amassed significant amounts of data in response to the individual training and technical assistance evaluations collected by staff. Of even more importance in their efforts to develop a statewide data collection system, however, were the data collection requirements of State Legislative procedures. Building on these databases and using JTPA funds, the Coalition contracted to study the feasibility for developing a statewide data collection system that would capture information from volunteer literacy programs tied to ABE programs, LLA Councils, and LVA affiliates, and as well as those not tied to ABE programs. The study's objectives were to: (1) identify data already being collected; (2) identify agencies collecting data; (3) analyze the data for strengths and gaps; and (4) make recommendations for the design of a data collection system.

The study was conducted for the Job Training Division, New Mexico Department of Labor; the final report, Statewide Tracking System Data Collection, was submitted in June 1989. The report resulted in modifications to the ABE data collection system. Upon review, the Coalition determined that it would be more efficient to feed data from other collection sources (i.e., JTPA, literacy programs reporting to LVA, etc.) through the ABE data collection system rather than develop or duplicate the system elsewhere.

To begin developing a system of accountability, the Mississippi project wanted to conduct a needs assessment as a means of gathering information and statistics on literacy, and disseminating it to key groups and individuals. After reviewing approaches used by other states, the Coalition decided to model their needs assessment after a study conducted by the University of North Carolina's Highway Safety Research Center. The study was undertaken in cooperation with the Mississippi State Highway Patrol. Unfortunately, the findings turned out to be inconclusive; the Coalition made no other attempts to conduct a needs assessment.

4. Statewide Conferences

Approximately half (11) of the Literacy Challenge grantees convened a statewide conference around literacy issues (providing opportunities for continuing education, networking, and sharing information and ideas, etc.) as part of their project activities. (Even in those states which did not convene their own conference, staff frequently indicated that they attended other organizations' conferences to report on their initiatives.) In some instances (for example, Nevada, New York, Mississippi, and Alabama), the conference was used as a catalyst for developing a statewide literacy agenda.

The New York State project had as one of its two major activities the convening of a convention which was the culmination of 13 regional caucuses held around the state. The purpose of the convention was to articulate and establish the major issues facing adult literacy education in New York State. Ideas and recommendations from the caucuses were brought to a two-day Literacy Convention in early 1989. Meeting separately, learners and practitioners determined, and then ratified, a final set of literacy resolutions. These resolutions were then presented to an invited group of legislators, members of the press, the business community, staff of the State Education Department, members of the State Literacy Council, and other interested and influential individuals. The convention was planned to coincide with the State Legislative session. While the legislative response was less than hoped for, project staff were confident that their efforts to lay out a learner-defined agenda would have future utility to the State Department of Education.

An interesting example of resource and system expansion through the use of networking and conferences was the Volunteer Initiative Conference convened by the Delaware Coalition for Literacy in 1988. Its major goal was to address issues of recruitment, training, placing, and supervising of volunteers. Eight organizations and agencies, including Literacy Volunteers of America, ABE programs, correctional institutions, and vocational technical programs, formed partnerships in the use of volunteers. Delaware convened a second conference entitled "Building a Quality Workforce," with 125 attendees from the business community as well as adult literacy students and in-school, at-risk students. This also was the only state to convene a conference specifically targeted to information and referral; 27 representatives of 23 organizations and agencies participated.

Like many of the projects, the Nevada Literacy Coalition (NLC) had multiple objectives associated with the convening of its statewide literacy conference entitled "Link to Literacy-Link to Life," including the provision of hands-on, practical literacy training and skills development; the provision of instructional materials enhancing application of training and skills development; and the bringing together of literacy program staff, tutors, teachers, and others involved in literacy. The conference was designed to involve Nevadans in all types of literacy activities and to provide opportunities for continuing education and a forum for sharing information and ideas. Most importantly, it was intended to strengthen the Nevada Literacy Coalition and to serve as a catalyst for developing a statewide literacy agenda. "Link to Literacy-Link to Life" was held in February 1988 in Las Vegas, cosponsored by the NLC, the Nevada State Library and Archives, and in cooperation with the Las Vegas Literacy Council and the Nevada Department of Education; 165 individuals attended this conference.

Citing the convening of a statewide literacy conference as one of its four primary goals, the Mississippi Literacy Coalition also intended to use the conference as a vehicle for establishing a statewide literacy agenda. The conference, entitled "Building the Future: Mississippi's Challenge of Adult Literacy" (held in November 1988), was also billed as the Governor's Third Annual Statewide Literacy Conference. According to conference materials, the purpose of the conference was to promote public and private sector cooperation and collaboration in alleviating the problems of illiteracy; present the family literacy concept in stopping the cycle of illiteracy in families; and develop an understanding of national trends. Speakers included Governor Ray Mabus, his wife Julie Mabus, others from the State Department of Education, and Jim Duffy, President of ABC Communications. There were approximately 525 people in attendance.

The conference convened by the Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy (WACAL) had the specific goals of informing private business about the impact of adult illiteracy on the state's economy as well as on the individual; acquainting decision makers with available resources; and encouraging groups to work together. Working with the Western Washington PLUS Task Force, Washington Literacy, the Governor's Office, and representatives of business, labor, and government, WACAL held the "Literacy for a More Productive Workforce" conference in November 1987. Designed primarily for business executives from around the state, approximately 94 individuals attended. Governor Booth Gardner, an advocate of state literacy programs, was the opening keynote speaker.

Participants agreed that the conference received favorable publicity (but probably less than it might have, as it had taken place the day after elections). Post-conference publicity was helpful and continued to raise awareness within the business community and the community at large. (More information on the WACAL workforce initiative is included below in Section E-3, Workplace Literacy.)

Statewide conferences were also held in Alabama, Alaska ("First Alaska Student Literacy Congress"), Indiana ("Conference on Literacy Instruction"), New Mexico ("Working Common Ground"), Oregon (two conferences, attended by providers), and Pennsylvania ("Pennsylvania Yes!").

5. Statewide Plans

Approximately one-third of the Literacy Challenge projects involved developing at least some aspects of a statewide plan for the expansion of literacy efforts. In most instances, the statewide conferences referenced above were part of the statewide plan development process. However, depending upon the complexity of the existing literacy system in the state, project planning activities varied from specific to broadly based. In states such as Minnesota, where there were already well established systems, with a plan already in place, there was no need for a statewide plan to be developed by the project. Conversely, in states such as New Mexico and Mississippi where the Gannett Foundation dollars provided the first successful opportunity to convene a coalition, one of the major activities of the project was to develop of a statewide plan.

Also reflecting start-up activities, the Nevada Literacy Coalition developed a Task Force charged with the responsibility for developing a comprehensive three-year plan for future cooperation and coordination of statewide literacy activity, using information acquired by a statewide needs assessment and insight gained from the statewide literacy conference. This planning activity increased in the second year of the project, with action plans developed to include the Coalition in the Nevada State Library's 1989 budget and to develop a Foundation for Literacy in the state.

6. Public Policy

The Gannett Foundation perception was that public policy initiatives, as reflected in the submitted Challenge Grant proposals, came from basically two different sources: the "top down," e.g., from the state at either the Governor's level or at the agency level; or from the volunteer and private sector. As it was a primary intention of virtually all of the projects to raise public awareness and concern about adult literacy issues, with the secondary intention to increase resources for the expansion of adult literacy services, by definition almost all of the projects hoped to influence public policy development and decisions.

Some of the projects more uniquely situated to impact on public policy were formed within state government. These projects were frequently associated with "umbrella" structures such as Governors' Offices, as for example in Puerto Rico, Mississippi, and Maine. In these cases the direct access which the project staff had to decision makers gave them an advantage in pressing their case for allocation of resources to adult literacy. Yet another group of projects located within state agencies, including Alabama, Connecticut, Indiana, and Nevada, at least had enhanced opportunities to influence the public policy decisions of those agencies within which they were housed. And finally, even those nonprofit, 501(c)(3) organizations located outside of state government structure, for example, New Mexico and Washington, frequently pursued both the legislative branch and the executive branch of government in their search for support and resources.

So it can be said that virtually all of the projects had public policy influencing as a component of their efforts to survive and to expand the resources available for adult literacy services. With few exceptions, the literacy programs competed with other service delivery programs for public awareness and support, political attention and endorsement, and funding. Hence, success in influencing public policy, particularly with regard to the allocation of resources, was essential not only to the very survival of most of the coalition efforts, but also to the further development of the adult literacy systems.

In addition to the generic public policy issues raised above, some of the Literacy Challenge grant projects had components which were specifically targeted to influencing public policy. These projects, and associated activities, met with varying levels of success.

In New York, the primary goal of the project was to develop a comprehensive, widely supported adult literacy agenda to be submitted to state government representatives, particularly those in the Legislature. The intention was to influence subsequent state-level priorities and funding for adult literacy services.

Through an elaborate process, which involved the convening of 13 regional caucuses and a statewide convention, 250 resolutions were developed and then winnowed down to 20, reflective of student and practitioner input and endorsement. These resolutions were then to be used as the basis for lobbying various relevant entities and individuals on behalf of adult literacy resources. Unfortunately, at the time of the site visit, staff expressed disappointment about the impact of the recommendations. Some optimism remained that since the recommendations are "concrete," they can be presented again to a legislative audience at an opportune time. Nevertheless, absent funds and/or a commitment for a focused, continuous pressure on the State Legislature, it is not likely that impact on public policy at the legislative level will occur, at least not with regard to the specific issues raised by this initiative.

The New York project's lack of success in garnering the attention of the Legislature suggests many things, not the least of which is the difficulty of navigating one's way though an institution as complex as a state legislature. In those instances in which Literacy Challenge grantees reported success in directly influencing public policy, either through program or funding changes and/or investments (New Mexico, discussed below, as the prime example), staff indicated that enormous amounts of time and energy had to be devoted to the process. These investments had to be made on an ongoing basis and required both Board and staff attention.

Several other states worked to develop and present legislative proposals for increasing and enhancing literacy services. Although not directly funded as part of the Gannett Foundation initiative, such recommendations were an early part of the Minnesota (MALC) Five-Year Plan. Working with the State Planning Agency, MALC subsequently established an Interagency Task Force to develop comprehensive state policy and legislative proposals for the 1989 legislative session. Successes included the $100,000 appropriation for broadcasting and promoting the GED-on-TV series; an appropriation of $75,000 to begin a comprehensive evaluation of all of the basic skills programs in the state; and legislation allowing qualifying individuals over the age of 21 to complete their high school education free of charge at public schools, area learning centers, post secondary, or approved alternative diploma programs.

Another state which directly sought to influence public policy through the redistribution of funds was New Mexico. This project found itself in a unique political situation in that a great deal of discussion—and controversy—was occurring at the time of its creation as a 501(c)(3). This debate concerned the relative merits of private vs. public service delivery systems, including various human services such as literacy. Powerful political leaders differed as to the desirability of one system over the other; the Governor sought privatization. In part because of its status as a nonprofit organization seeking a wide base of funds, and unfettered by state agency constraints, the New Mexico Coalition was able to vigorously pursue the Legislature through the commitment of staff resources and the intervention of its Board of Directors.

While not listing the development of legislation or influencing public policy as specific activities of its project, the Oregon Literacy Connection reported that it was instrumental in the passage of legislation which provided $150,000 to fund a literacy hotline and the statewide coordination of adult literacy information and services, effective July 1989.

Influencing public policy at the local level was one of four major activities of the Illinois Literacy Resource Development Project (ILRDP). This initiative, designed to increase resources, was structured into four active task forces, each of which produced a substantial document to be used for technical assistance and resource enhancement.

Among other accomplishments, the Impacting Local Public Policy Task Force developed policy statements and strategies that local literacy providers could use to raise awareness of the problems of illiteracy, thereby potentially influencing public policy and increasing adult literacy funds. The Task Force produced a document (Impacting Local Public Policy) specific to these issues. And, in its second year the ILRDP formed a Statewide Implementation Task Force to develop statewide strategies, including strengthening existing statewide networks and developing a statewide policy agenda.

The Massachusetts Coalition for Adult Literacy (MCAL) project contained several components designed to influence public policy. One of the Coalition's major objectives was to keep members of the Massachusetts Legislature, the Board of Education, the Board of Regents, the Board of Literary Commissioners, the Governor's Office, and other significant state agencies informed of literacy activities, issues, and needs.

MCAL sought to play a role in the public sector initiatives evolving around it, including the development of the Commonwealth Literacy Corps (CLC), a part of the Governor's Literacy Initiative to recruit, train, and place volunteer literacy tutors. The Coalition formed a Public Policy Committee to work closely with CLC to develop an advisory and planning document which outlined a Workforce Literacy Strategy for Massachusetts, with suggested guidelines and strategies for developing various comprehensive volunteer programs. The intent of the plan was to develop a statewide, comprehensive system for the delivery of ABE services that would lead to universal basic adult literacy and better employment opportunities. MCAL hoped to provide ongoing expertise and advice on planning, implementation, and evaluation to the Literacy Corps.

The Coalition and its Public Policy Committee focused a considerable amount of their attention on legislative work, including the recruitment of 51 legislative "Primary Sponsors" for the "Act to Strengthen Workforce Literacy" (H5465) and the coordination of a statewide campaign called "Educate a Legislator." Other activities included the "Meet and Greet" campaign, involving local service providers and invited legislative representatives and staff; the "Legislative Briefing Day," providing information about literacy needs and building constituency support for specific additional state money in the 1989 state budget; a directory of all senators and representatives and the adult literacy programs within their voting districts, to be used by legislators and by ABE programs; and the "Press Conference," introducing legislation to implement the Workforce Literacy Plan.

D. Evaluations

One section of the Gannett Foundation grant application specifically required applicants to state the measures by which they could determine (evaluate) the effectiveness and successes of their proposed activities. Hence, all of the projects had evaluation potential. The actual conduct of evaluation activities varied widely, from those projects which developed and implemented formal procedures (including, in some cases, a third party evaluation), to minimal evaluation efforts and little or no record keeping. In several instances, such as Illinois, significant evaluation and assessment activities took place around specific project activities or products, but no efforts were made to evaluate or assess the overall achievements or impact of the Literacy Challenge initiative. Major evaluation efforts were undertaken by Connecticut, Indiana, Minnesota, Mississippi, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, and Washington. Needless to say, they met with varying success. Some of these efforts are described below. The actual outcomes and findings of the evaluations are documented in detail in the Individual Project Reports.

The Connecticut project, Project LINC, hired a professional evaluator to design and execute a formative evaluation. The RFP was prepared by the Bureau of Adult Education and distributed to known agencies and individuals with experience in evaluation design and familiarity with adult education programs. Researchers from the University of Connecticut's School of Education were selected to design and execute the evaluation, which was in place shortly after the project began. The evaluation documented the extent to which each of the three LINC components (the LINC Committee, the student services, and the Literacy Assistants) functioned. A document, Final Evaluation Report: Literacy Improvement Needs Collaboration (LINC), was produced in July 1989.

The Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition (IALC) intended to develop an ongoing evaluation process through which the effectiveness of the state's efforts could be assessed over the course of the project's activities, using both process and impact measures. Reliable baseline data would be available, and an ongoing system would be developed by which a common core of data would be collected annually. The standard data collection and reporting process would be developed at the state level, and local coalitions would provide information on numbers of volunteers trained, learners served, and other relevant data.

In 1986, the IALC established a task force to design such an evaluation. IALC initially proposed to use Gannett Foundation funds to hire a part-time Evaluation Assistant, who was to work with a university-based evaluation expert in designing evaluation instruments, collecting data, analyzing results, and documenting the process. Staff felt that the evaluation system had the potential to be a national model, as Indiana's project would be the first attempt to implement a statewide plan to collect data systematically and in an ongoing fashion from agencies and organizations across various networks and lines of authority.

An alternative model for conducting the evaluation was chosen, and an RFP was issued indicating the availability of $22,500 to conduct the evaluation. Professional evaluation consultants, D. Bonnet Associates, were selected to design and conduct the evaluation; they submitted their report, An Evaluation of Adult Literacy Efforts in Indiana, in April 1988. The eight-month study evaluated the impact of the collective efforts of the state Coalition, local coalitions, and the Project Literacy U.S. campaign, and developed a database of literacy providers and recommendations for its maintenance and improvement.

Although not specific to Gannett Foundation-funded activities, in 1988 the Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign (the lead agency in the Minnesota Coalition) hired an independent research firm, EnSearch, to evaluate the overall effectiveness of its efforts. The evaluation confirmed that significant progress had been made in addressing the strategies identified in their Five-Year Plan and documented that the organization had been successful in increasing public awareness, recruiting adult learners and volunteers, and increasing coordination among literacy providers, and dealing with the State Legislature.

The Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign Board and staff intended to conclude all activities in 1991 with a final evaluation and accounting of its efforts over its five-year lifespan.

More than any of the other statewide initiatives funded by the Gannett Foundation, the Mississippi Literacy Coalition described extensive and elaborate evaluation activities in its proposal. Working with the Coalition Advisory Committee, the Literacy Coordinator was to oversee an evaluation process consisting of four logical and sequential components: (1) Internal Formative (assembling relevant data and other forms of information to determine the degree to which objectives are being accomplished, and taking corrective actions); (2) External Formative (selection of an outside institution or agency to conduct an ongoing external evaluation of project activities); (3) Internal Summative (an internal team to review the progress of each program activity); and (4) External Summative (also conducted by the external formative evaluation team, to conduct a comprehensive and objective review of the project, submitted in a written report detailing the team's findings and recommendations).

Despite these ambitious expectations, the Coalition actually only completed one evaluation activity, that of assessing the Coalition's "tutor intervention model programs" being demonstrated in three locations (representing urban, country and community college sites). These programs were designed to facilitate the transition of Laubach Literacy students to GED or ABE classes (with the hope of reducing the number of dropouts in the Mississippi literacy program. (The Tutor Intervention Model Program is described in more detail above in Section B-2, Tutors.)

Dr. William Hetrick and Thomas Cosby from the University of Southern Mississippi prepared the independent evaluation report. They collected information through a series of on-site visits to all three model programs and through personal interviews with program supervisors, teachers, and programs participants. In addition, each of the program's supervisors submitted materials to provide insight as to what had been accomplished to date. The evaluators used the Handbook for Tutor Intervention Models (prepared by the project) as the basic guideline for appraising the programs.

While concluding that the program had "excellent potential to make a significant difference in reducing the high dropout rate among those students completing Laubach as they go on to ABE or GED courses," the report concluded that the short length of time that the programs had been functioning, and the lack of baseline data, made it impossible to determine their effectiveness or ineffectiveness. The report included recommendations to collect data and develop effective recording procedures to determine further impact.

In Nevada, the intent was to take the information collected via the statewide needs assessment and the Nevada Literacy Activity Reporting System and synthesize it to make the efforts of the project visible. Measurable activities included: frequency of calls on the statewide toll-free number; numbers of new students and volunteer tutors enrolled in programs; student progress to higher reading levels; duration of participation by both students and tutors; progress of local organizations receiving training and consulting; and performance of the Nevada Literacy Coalition in terms of goals met.

Later in the conduct of this long (three years) project, additional, relatively complex (certainly time consuming) evaluation activities were proposed, as follows: (1) Evaluate coalition development; (2) evaluate the recruitment and retention of literacy volunteers and adult learners; and (3) evaluate literacy program coordinators' skills in volunteer management. Despite these expectations, in correspondence dated December 1990, staff reported that they had completed only one formal evaluation task, which was to determine how the manual entitled Volunteer Development: Strengthening Your Literacy Program was being used. The evaluation was mailed to 93 literacy programs as well as 46 workshop attendees. Responses were modest and allowed for only some general conclusions, such as the evident correlation between attendance at workshops and use of the manual.

Although not initially focusing specifically on evaluating the activities and outcomes of the project itself, the New Mexico Coalition did amass significant amounts of data in response to individual training and technical assistance evaluations and as a result of the data collection required by its State Legislature (see above Section C-3, Information and Reporting Enhancements). This information served them well in their efforts to obtain state-appropriated funds, as they were able to document need and impact associated with adult literacy services.

The Oregon Literacy project (OLC) included extensive evaluation activities as two of its five major goals: (1) To evaluate learner progress in volunteer literacy tutor programs, through the planning and design of evaluation processes, instruments, and program implementations; and (2) to evaluate the overall effectiveness of Oregon's Literacy Connection project, through the establishment of a formative evaluation design and the conduct of a formative evaluation. The Coalition contracted with the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory (NREL) to design and implement these two evaluation initiatives. A Coalition Task Force provided oversight for the evaluation activities.

Regarding the first of these, the long-range intent to help volunteer literacy programs evaluate the effectiveness of their programs, the overall goal was to design and implement evaluation methods that programs themselves could continue to use to evaluate their effectiveness and identify areas where improvement was needed. (This goal was not achieved.) The NREL set out to identify factors which contribute to the success of adult learners. Assessment of learner progress and interviews with all program participants (learners, tutors, and administrators) were conducted in a sample of programs. The strategy was to compare learners' goals with outcomes based on program records; assessments of learners' literacy skills; performance on real-life (functional) tasks that were part of their goals; and interviews with learners, tutors, administrators, and tutor trainers. Coalition staff recognized that the evaluation methods needed to be suited to the diversity of adult learner goals and the variety of programs and instructional approaches in use throughout the state.

To identify the characteristics of successful programs, the evaluation activities focused on programs which already had adopted a uniform system of record keeping. Three sample programs were selected: (1) Mount Hood Literacy Coalition, a large program in an urban setting (Gresham), connected to a well-established community college ABE program; (2) Learn to Read, a large program in a small town (Dalles), connected to a small, but well-established area education district (which contracted with a community college for its services); and (3) Lincoln County Literacy Alliance, a very small program in a rural, somewhat isolated coastal location (Newport).

Comparisons of experiences, attitudes and opinions, and skills over time provided the basis for determining the effectiveness of these volunteer tutor efforts. Because evaluation of learner progress got off to a late start (as did other components of the initiative), the post-interviews had to be postponed into the second year of the project to allow sufficient time to elapse so that learner progress could be documented.

In June 1989, NREL staff submitted a detailed report, Learner Progress in Three Volunteer Literacy Tutor Programs: Final Report, on the evaluation of learner progress and effectiveness in the three volunteer tutor programs (based on interviews with 10 of the 39 original learners and questionnaire responses from 23 of the original 32 tutors).

To assess the overall effectiveness of the Literacy Coalition, the staff proposed that a format for logging all project activities would be established early on so that all involved would be responsible for helping document the project's work as it occurred. They were concerned that the multiple activities of the project would be hard to monitor and record with any level of detail. A detailed Activity Log form was developed and distributed to all key actors, to be filled out and returned directly to the evaluator. Not surprisingly, after one month of filling out the log, it became apparent that this form of documentation was too time consuming. Despite this hopeful beginning, a better system was not developed by the end of the first year of the grant. Only the Project Coordinator kept a calendar of her activities and sent them in her reports to the Gannett Foundation, copies of which were distributed to the Task Force members. As later stated during the site visit, given the wide rage of tasks and responsibilities of the Coordinator, any other record keeping came to be regarded as too difficult to maintain.

In another effort to measure the impact of the Literacy Connection Project itself, a one-page evaluation questionnaire was developed to determine the utility of the project's efforts in the field. Originally intended to be sent to the recipients of the project's services, it was eventually distributed at a meeting of ABE and local coalition directors. The Coalition Task Force also filled out a year-end survey, reflecting on the past year and answering four general questions about their experiences working with this consortium of agencies. There was considerable agreement that the major accomplishments of the project thus far were the establishment and growth of networking and statewide direction via the Task Force itself and the development of its tutor training modules.

The Washington Coalition (WACAL) proposed that evaluation of its project be based on both existing and potential data collection mechanisms and evaluation designs specifically developed for the project's components. Both process and outcome measures were to be used.

Process data would include documentation of activities and progress made in carrying out the work plans of the project staff, including reports from the Hotline. Specific outcome data was to include assessments of the numbers and dispositions of volunteer and student referrals made, and of adult student involvement and progress in the pilot project. Results of the project were to be presented in the project's two interim report and its final project report, which would be widely disseminated.

The only component of the project for which evaluation activities were actually conducted was the student and volunteer referral system. An evaluation survey was undertaken in October 1988 and February 1989 to determine its effectiveness. The survey included questions concerning length of time before the caller was matched with a program and the reasons a caller was not able to become involved. Survey respondents were also given the opportunity to make further comments concerning literacy programs or the referral system. In addition, the Hotline contacted students and volunteers to determine the effectiveness of the referral system.

Through the referral system evaluation surveys, the Hotline found that once students and volunteers became involved with a literacy program, they tended to continue with it. However, many people, both students and volunteers, called the Hotline for information but did not choose to become involved.

For example, in the February 1989 survey, results indicated that of those who called the Hotline between August and December 1988, approximately 47 percent of the volunteers and 55 percent of the students became involved with a local literacy program as a direct result of the Hotline referrals. Each prospective student call to the Hotline was followed up by a referral letter, and programs were notified monthly of callers from their area, providing a third opportunity to make contact with adults who needed help. The approximately 40 percent of students who chose not be involved with a literacy program cited a broad range of reasons such as lack of time, work, family or health problems, and program-related problems. Students also cited several reasons for not choosing to continue with a tutor, including lack of time, work conflicts, moving away, or program-related reasons.

The Hotline staff hoped to continue to refine the referral system evaluation survey and to conduct future surveys on a periodic basis. They also hoped to draft a data-based software marketing plan for the Hotline referral and record keeping system and to locate a software packager or manufacturer for a possible partnership. Unfortunately, these plans did not materialize.

Other states engaged in more "modest" evaluation efforts, primarily targeted to individual project components rather than overall project impact. For example, in Puerto Rico the Department of Education was interested in determining the effectiveness of the program and the impact of student achievements. This reflected their interest in widely disseminating the activities of the initiative. Hence, the training program for staff and teachers included pre- and post-evaluations of all sessions in order to make improvements and better adapt the training to subsequent participants. In the Maine initiative, only the Improvisational Theater component of the project was evaluated. (See above Section A-1, Public Awareness.) And in Illinois, there were relatively extensive evaluation activities associated with the development of the Task Force Manuals (the major activity of the ILRDP). Other "partial" evaluations included Kentucky (individual conferences) and New York (local caucuses).

Alabama's evaluation/assessment consisted of a memo written by Brent Halverson from Auburn University's Center for Vocational and Adult Education. The assessment concluded with recommendations for the continuation and expansion of activities. A major recommendation was that the ALC seek interim private and/or public funds and work with the Governor and Legislature to establish a line item in the General Fund Budget to support the work of the Coalition in the future.

In Pennsylvania, potential evaluation data on local coalition activities were limited to (but not analyzed in) the final reports. Except for financial reports from local coalitions receiving seed funds, there were no systematic reporting mechanisms. Only anecdotal information was available on specific local coalitions, and the Institute maintained files including local newsletters, conference announcements, and similar materials.

The Rhode Island project did not conduct any overall evaluation activities. Staff indicated in progress reports that four companies agreed to work with the Department in piloting the teleconferencing process and that "academic gains were measured; the results showed that participants learned and retained a very high percentage." Similarly, they reported that 34 people participated in ABE classes in public housing projects over a six month period, and that "progress was measured and advances made. Ten advanced to the GED level." However, they kept no documentation on these activities.

Finally, in several states no evaluation activities occurred even though evaluation activities had been proposed. For example, between January and April 1989, the Alaska Office of Adult and Vocational Education (OAVE) planned to conduct a summative evaluation through an interview procedure with trainers, volunteer tutors, and students. The evaluation was to coincide with technical assistance provided by OAVE adult education staff to volunteer coordinators and tutors. Project staff were to conduct a formative evaluation through weekly telephone contact with volunteer coordinators in the sites where volunteer tutors would be working with students. Despite these plans, the summative evaluation, which was to be conducted by the Office of Adult and Vocational Education in 1989, was not done.

In Tennessee, it was the proposed intention of the Coalition's Oversight Committee to submit four comprehensive written progress reports which would include detailed information about the characteristics of the coalition-building process and progress on the state literacy agenda. Staff intended to develop and administer evaluation instruments to participants in the training sessions, and to those involved with local coalition development. They did not develop those instruments, however, and although some evaluation activities were conducted after the conference and training sessions, no overall self-evaluation activities took place. Progress reports and year-end reports were completed and submitted to the Gannett Foundation.

Similarly, the California project staff reported that although individual workshop evaluations were conducted, the originally proposed follow-up evaluation of the effectiveness of the referral processes was not done. In Massachusetts, although potential evaluation measures were indicated in the proposal (such as information and referral Hotline records and statistics), no subsequent attempt was made to evaluate the project.

E. Unique Project Components

This section presents information on elements of the Literacy Challenge grants which were somewhat unusual in nature, and/or of targeted interest. Information is included on special populations, computer technology, workplace literacy, welfare reform and literacy, and family literacy. In some instances, information is limited but included so that those particularly interested in an issue will know that it was addressed and can follow up with the state's contact person.

1. Special Populations

Several projects contained components focusing on the following special populations: Hispanics; Native Americans and Alaskans; inner city residents; high school and college students as tutors; learning disabled illiterate adults; persons with AIDS; lawyers; and prison populations.

a. Hispanics. The New Mexico Coalition focused a great deal of its attention and energies on developing pilot demonstration projects in distinct prototype communities, selected because of their high need levels and minimal available resources. The local demonstration projects were also chosen because they were operated by private, nonprofit organizations known to be responsive to underserved communities and populations. Two of the selected sites provided services primarily to Hispanics, while two were targeted to Native American communities. The sites were as follows:

1. Mora County, serving a primarily Hispanic population. With a county population of 4,800, approximately 34 percent of the residents were below the poverty line; the unemployment rate was near 30 percent; 28 percent of the families were headed by women; and the population was 95 percent Hispanic.

   The project was to develop a basic developmental skills literacy program for approximately 30 rural, low-income adults and out-of-school youth with reading, speaking, and writing difficulties. The program was delivered by the Home Education Livelihood Program (HELP) Literacy Program located in Mora. HELP provided a number of social services, including intake and outreach, and general public outreach and information. Sixty adult learners were recruited; 5 volunteers were trained; and three tutor trainers and five program staff trainers were trained.

2. Albuquerque SER-Jobs for Progress, also serving a primarily Hispanic population. The Coalition worked with Albuquerque SER-Jobs for Progress, an affiliate of a national organization promoting educational and economic opportunities for Hispanics.

   The project objective involved the utilization of Family Learning Centers (FLC) and state-of-the art equipment and approaches to provide literacy instruction for approximately 75 economically disadvantaged Hispanic youth and adults. The FLC's strategy included a combination of computer-assisted instruction, qualified classroom instructors, and other support personnel to deliver quality educational programs as well as family life services on parenting, drug prevention, immigration, and citizenship. Gannett Foundation funds were used entirely on publicizing and providing materials for the literacy portion of the project. As of April 1989, 45 adult learners had been recruited; 14 volunteers were participating; and 4 tutor trainers and 5 program staff trainers were trained.

Obviously, the Puerto Rico initiative involved Hispanic populations. The project focused heavily on the recruitment and training of tutors. The intent was to create comprehensive interdisciplinary voluntary literacy programs that would offer reading assistance and instruction to adult illiterates and out-of-school youth.

The tutor training materials used by the Puerto Rico project emphasized current events, consumer information, health, and other subjects of interest to the students; all materials were in both English and Spanish. More information about this initiative is included above in Section B-2, Tutors.

The Illinois Coalition (ILRDP) participated in the development of a 30-minute documentary videotape highlighting the problems of illiteracy and ways to access resources specifically in the Illinois Hispanic community. This videotape was shown in the Chicago area. Staff also filmed for the Hispanic Literacy Council a videotape on monies available to Hispanic literacy programs.

California defined the number and variety of its citizens who speak other languages as one of its most challenging circumstances. In part because of the Amnesty Act and its deadlines, the English as a Second Language (ESL) system was "swamped" with students, with approximately 79 percent of all enrollments in basic education programs receiving primarily ESL instruction. ESL classes reflected over-representation of Asians and Hispanics, as large numbers of Asian and Latin American immigrants reside in California. Staff reported that these individuals are often highly motivated, and that this motivation carries over to participation in available adult education programs. With limited resources, programs were quickly filled by immigrants, leaving fewer opportunities to reach the more difficult and/or less motivated potential students. (It was California's experience that native English speaking adult illiterates were difficult to recruit and retain in literacy programs; hence, both black and white groups were underrepresented in the service delivery system.)

Individuals in California were quite direct in voicing their concerns about the problem and the associated policy issues of having to prioritize students in the face of inadequate services and resources; this problem was vexing for many states.

Gannett Foundation funds were used within the Kentucky project to expand an existing videotape training series which had been developed by Kentucky Educational Television (KET). A new videotape module on English as a Second Language was created along with accompanying materials.

And finally, the Minnesota (MALC) training coordinator developed ESL materials for a special training project for Hmong refugees in St. Paul.

b. Native Americans and Alaskans. As referenced earlier, the New Mexico Coalition focused on developing pilot demonstration sites, two of which were targeted to Native Americans. Two of New Mexico's 19 Indian pueblos were selected because of their rural nature and large percentages of native-speaking tribal members who could benefit from English literacy proficiency. The two sites, to be coordinated by the All Indian Pueblo Council, were as follows:

1. San Felipe Pueblo, located between Albuquerque and Santa Fe. The San Felipe Pueblo population reflected high levels of school dropouts: 50 percent of those in the 25-50 age group had not completed high school, and 80 percent of the adults over the age of 50 had received no schooling or literacy assistance.

   It was the project's intention to bring together several existing agencies, which were already serving the community, to develop a community-based literacy and ESL program serving 25 students. The Coalition, working closely with the All Indian Pueblo Council, would initiate the program and provide continuing coordination until the project was self-sufficient.

   This particular initiative experienced significant difficulties in getting started and did not develop sufficiently to receive the Gannett Foundation's $10,000 "seed" support grant from the Coalition. Subsequently, assistance money available under a state legislative appropriation in 1989-90 was also requested but again not granted. In late 1990, however, the Coalition Executive Director reported that the San Felipe Pueblo applied for assistance under the 1990-91 appropriation, and the request was approved.

2. Jemez Pueblo, located approximately 45 miles northwest of Albuquerque. The Pueblo had a population of about 2,343 and an unemployment rate of approximately 43 percent. Similar to the San Felipe Pueblo, it was the project's objective to bring together several existing agencies serving this community to develop a concerted effort for a community-based literacy and ESL program serving 25 students. The Coalition, working with others, would initiate the program and provide continuing coordination until the project was self-sufficient. The final product was to be a complete manual suitable for dissemination to assist in establishing similar projects for American Indian communities.

   Implementing the Jemez Pueblo pilot literacy program was a complex and time-consuming process as it involved establishing a literacy program sensitive to the needs of a local tribal community. Nevertheless, progress was made; LVA tutor training materials and student textbooks and tapes were selected and ordered.

The Coalition Executive Director reported in November 1990 that the Jemez Pueblo pilot project was proceeding much more slowly than originally anticipated, as the process of promoting community involvement and ownership of this project was very slow. Training was held in October 1990, with enough community interest generated to result in a LSCA Title VI grant for a library-based literacy program awarded to the Jemez Library for 1990-91.

Unfortunately, no "how-to" manual on developing literacy programs in Native American communities has yet been generated. It was the Coalition Executive Director's opinion that it would be premature to do so at this time. Several Native American pilot projects were sponsored under the 1989-90 New Mexico legislative appropriation with widely varying degrees of success. The Coalition identified six or seven necessary elements for a successful program and provided support services to Native American communities facing barriers in developing their programs. As reported: "Such a manual would be of great use, but we anticipate that not enough will be known about the process for another few years."

The Alaska Literacy Coalition (ALC) focused significant efforts on its indigenous Eskimo population. The ALC made available culturally sensitive materials previously developed by the Alaska Adult Literacy Laboratory: Two series were reprinted: Level I Series, 1-5: The Jones Family; How We Live; The Seasons; In the Village; and Along the River. And Level II Series, 1-5: Nanalook; Nanalook's Summer; Nanalook's Stories; More Stories; and Waiting.

c. Inner City Residents. The Connecticut initiative (Project LINC) was targeted to the inner city populations of Bridgeport, and worked closely with an alliance of black churches to recruit liaisons—"Literacy Assistants" to function as tutors (a unique component of the project)—and students.

A summary report on Project LINC, Recruiting Adult Nonreaders from the Inner City, was published in November 1990. This report includes information on student services and strategies for outreach and recruitment. (More detailed information on Project LINC is included above in Section B-1, Students, and in Section B-2, Tutors.)

The Rhode Island project focused a major portion of its activities on trying to recruit tutors and students from a hard-to-reach population, those living in public housing. The specific goal was to increase substantially the number of single parent heads-of-households and limited-English-proficient adults receiving literacy training at a convenient and non-threatening site in public housing. The technique which the project piloted for reaching this population was the use of tele-instruction, which is teleconferencing by telephone. (More discussion on the relative merits of tele-instruction is included below in Section E-2, Computer Technology.) Activities included the development of materials for tele-instruction for public housing clients; recruitment and training of tutors; recruitment of students from public housing; recruitment of child care workers for public housing classes; development of training programs at each site; the provision of tele-instructional classes and support tutoring for two public housing-based groups of clients, with each group having 8 to 10 students each; and eventual dissemination of the program to additional public housing sites in other towns and cities throughout the state.

Because Providence has the largest illiterate population in Rhode Island, as well as the greatest number of public housing units, it was selected as the pilot site for project activities. As stated in the proposal: "Approximately 90 percent of public housing residents in Providence are female, single heads-of-households. In addition, 80 percent of these are minorities many of whom are limited-English proficient. Many of these people dropped out of school at an early age and have a great deal of fear of returning to what they determine to be the negative environment of the classroom setting."

Working with personnel from the Housing Authority, project staff attempted to create an awareness among the residents and to identify the adult nonreaders who were most likely to benefit from the service; meetings were held with the directors of public housing units and with the president of each units' tenants association. The Adult Education Instructor began to develop worksheets and curricula that would be tailored to the interests and needs of the residents. (The Instructor later concluded that extensive revisions of existing materials and curricula was not necessary in the use of teleconferencing.) An important component of the plan was to identify and hire a resident of the public housing unit who would be trained as a tutor (working with the Adult Education Instructor). VISTA Volunteers would be utilized to train the tutors and to be a resource to them throughout the program implementation phase.

The tutor would be on-site at the time of the tele-instruction, would help the students formulate questions for the instructor, and would provide them with assistance in understanding and completing their assignments. Tele-instruction classes would be offered for 30 weeks, 3 times weekly for 2 1/2 hours, both in the morning and the evening. Child care services would be provided during the time of the instruction and during study sessions. The same service would be provided, if necessary, for the evening classes.

Using the same goals, the Rhode Island project proposed to add eight more learning circles in public housing units in Providence in its second year of activity, and two public housing units in other geographic locations around the state. Despite this optimism, the expansion beyond Providence did not take place; as reported by staff, the greatest barrier to the expansion was obtaining space in additional public housing units. However, unexpected difficulties had occurred within the initiative which undoubtedly played a role in the lack of program expansion.

It was initially expected that individuals could be identified within the public housing projects themselves who would take on the role of facilitators and, in a sense, be a "role model" for others participating in the groups. Although staff indicated that they made significant attempts to recruit such individuals, this did not occur. The Adult Education Instructor concluded that the willingness to volunteer time was not present among this population. Making money available to pay facilitators might produce more positive results, but simply asking people to contribute their time and energy did not. The facilitator role was eventually taken on by the VISTA Volunteers assigned to the project.

At the time of the site visit, staff felt, in retrospect, that locating the services in the housing units was a very good idea even though they were ambivalent about the general isolation factor to which this contributed. There was further concern that individuals who live in such units frequently are loathe to leave them; that a kind of apathy sets in; and that whatever services can be brought "in" should be with the hope that they will provide an incentive to "move up and out."

As reported by staff in correspondence in April 1991, the tele-instructional system was in use until early July 1990. (An ACTION-VISTA Literacy Corps project to support the program was approved to start in February 1989, carrying the initiative beyond the Gannett Foundation grant period). Through the efforts of the Gannett Foundation project, five sites in public housing projects were established; approximately 83 individuals received instruction, some working at the ABE levels and others working with high school equivalency materials the Gannett Foundation project.

Another proposed initiative, in which Literacy Volunteers of America/Rhode Island considered using the tele-instruction system to train small groups of volunteer tutors (after they had viewed training videotapes already produced on VCR equipment), did not materialize due to differences over payment of the telephone calls. Similarly, a plan to create learning circles of public assistance recipients in Cranston to prepare for the high school equivalency examination did not take place.

Pennsylvania also made efforts to attract inner city residents. One of the members of the Pennsylvania State Coalition for Adult Literacy (and represented on the Coalition's Governing Board), the Mayor's Commission in Philadelphia developed very sophisticated audiovisual materials including a highly professional film (produced with a budget of approximately $85,000). The film has been shown in movie theaters throughout the Philadelphia area as part of an outreach initiative to inner city residents who lack reading skills. The Coalition distributed information about the film, but Gannett Foundation funds were not used for the initiative.

And finally, stating in their proposal that the adult literacy system, state-funded through libraries, was not reaching sufficient numbers of blacks (5 percent of students versus 13 percent in the general population), the California project proposed to increase the capacity of government and other appropriate agencies to identify nonreading adults so that they could be referred to literacy providers. The strategy was endorsed by the national, black Assault on Illiteracy Program. (More information on this initiative is included above in Section C, Resource and System Expansion.)

d. High School and College Students as Tutors. Three projects involved activities associated with high school and college students recruited and used as tutors. The Puerto Rico project actively recruited high school students as tutors, and staff were quite pleased with their success. They believed the approach was successful for reasons such as: (1) many adults like learning from students in the community since they know them, and (2) the high school students themselves take the programs seriously particularly since they received school credit (a half credit for 60 hours of their tutoring services) for participating.

Although only peripherally involved with the Tennessee Literacy Coalition, it is interesting to note that in Tennessee the Office of the Governor initiated the Youth Literacy Corps (later called the Governor's Study Partnership Plan) as an innovative approach to their illiteracy problems. In this project, outstanding high school students were recruited to tutor their peers: 325 students and 325 peer tutors were involved at 23 schools statewide. The programs were set up with the full support and cooperation of the participating high schools. Since South Central Bell stepped in to pay for these costs, approved Gannett Foundation funds allocated to support the printing and distribution of tutor manuals for the initiative did not have to be used.

Focused on recruiting college students, the Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy, on behalf of the Pennsylvania State Coalition for Adult Literacy, reported that it was instrumental in developing and coordinating the Pennsylvania Literacy Corps program. With $500,000 in funding from the State, the Corps program provided 13 colleges and universities in Pennsylvania with grants to establish literacy corps programs on their campuses. These schools were then to develop partnerships with local literacy providers and to provide appropriate coursework to college students to train them to do volunteer work in local literacy efforts.

e. Learning Disabled. Two projects developed materials specific to the learning disabled illiterate adult. The Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign (MALC) consisted of four major organizations including the Minnesota Learning Disabilities Association (LDA). Several of MALC's major activities were focused on addressing the needs of the learning disabled functionally illiterate adult population. In three training sessions to increase knowledge of learning disabilities and multisensory, phonics-based techniques, LDA staff sought to increase the teaching resources of new volunteers as tutors. They also conducted activities designed to increase knowledge about learning disabilities and provided technical assistance to teachers, trainers, and volunteer tutors associated with services to the learning disabled. In the second year of the Gannett Foundation funding, project staff expanded these efforts to include training new volunteers as math tutors.

An important activity was the development of the Step-By-Step teacher handbooks begun in 1987 to provide additional resources for trainers, teachers, and volunteer tutors. Included in the series is a reading handbook, consisting of four major sections: phonics, sound/symbol relationships, reading comprehension, and writing composition; an accompanying student handbook; and a spelling handbook. The materials are tailored for the learning disabled adult with reading skills below the seventh grade level. In the second year of the project, a teacher's handbook of math instructions was developed in the format of an "idea book" for interventions or strategies to help students over specific learning hurdles. Since the costs were prohibitive, hopes for the development of supplementary videotapes to accompany these teacher handbooks did not materialize during the Gannett Foundation project period.

Within the context of the Kentucky initiative, Kentucky Educational Television (KET) developed a video training tape ("Teach An Adult to Read") focused on working with individuals with developmental disabilities. The tape and accompanying print materials were made available for distribution.

Although the Oregon project proposed activities in its second year targeted to adult disabled readers (evaluate assessment tools; develop and field test an instrument to establish a learner profile for diagnostic and prescriptive services), no progress on these activities was reported. In February 1988 correspondence, staff indicated that they had refocused this element of the project, reducing it in scope. No products resulted from their efforts.

f. Persons with AIDS. In a unique effort, the California project (CAL) attempted to reach out to public health workers. Under the auspices of the San Diego AIDS Network, a workshop was held with participants from a variety of agencies working with AIDS patients, and with those at risk of contracting AIDS, such as IV drug users. The initial reason for the Network's interest in the issue of literacy was their uncertainty that the literacy levels of their target populations were sufficient for clients to understand their pamphlets and brochures. Various written materials were shared and discussed, as were additional techniques for communicating with at-risk populations. A conclusion of the workshop was that there is an enormous potential for literacy service providers to work with public health providers and agencies to make public health educational materials more sensitive to the needs of those with literacy problems.

g. Lawyers. In another unusual effort, the Massachusetts Coalition for Adult Literacy (MCAL) conducted a joint initiative with the Massachusetts Bar Association. The intent was to interest attorneys in volunteering their time. While several options were provided including pro-bono legal services, most respondents expressed a preferred interest in tutoring.

h. Inmates. Three Literacy Challenge projects involved corrections (prisons) components. A major initiative of the second year (a Bonus Grant) of the Gannett Foundation grant awarded to Alaska was to train trainers for Alaska's correctional facilities. The goal was to deliver one workshop to educational associates or other representatives from each of the state's correctional facilities who would then train inmates to tutor illiterate adults in the state's prisons. There was some success in their efforts in that representatives from three prisons (Eagle River, Bethel, and Juneau) attended workshops and subsequently had at least one individual trained and able to provide training and tutoring within each of the prisons. While the State Department of Corrections indicated its intention to extend the training to other facilities in the future, the initiative did not develop beyond this point.

The New Mexico Coalition targeted some of its pilot demonstration activities in Cibola County to reaching its prison population. An ESL training session was held at the Western New Mexico Corrections Facility, in which six tutors were trained; however, at the conclusion of the Gannett Foundation grant period, the training had not been implemented for inmates.

The Nevada Literacy Coalition stated in its second year proposal that it intended to establish a plan for literacy programs in line with new legislative mandates for literacy activity in prisons. In Nevada, the Department of Education is responsible for inmate education. Coalition staff felt that there was sufficient state funding to provide literacy training to inmates. Meetings were held with the state and private organizations concerned with carrying out these mandates, including the Department of Education, the State Prison System, Governor's Office, Northern Nevada Literacy Council, literacy programs in southern Nevada, and representatives for the use of technology in literacy. Tasks to be accomplished included obtaining funds for tutor training and supplies and securing prison facilities for tutoring and storage of materials and equipment.

2. Computer Technology

The states participating in the Gannett Foundation initiative varied widely in "computer readiness," and the projects themselves reflected that variation in the use of computer technology.

Like many of the other states, Alabama staff stated that: "Technology and computer assistance training is not here yet." At the other end of the continuum were two projects (Minnesota and New Mexico) that developed sophisticated components.

The Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign was composed of four major literacy organizations, one of which was the Technology for Literacy Center (TLC). TLC, funded by the St. Paul Public Schools, local foundations, and the Department of Community Education, used the latest in computers and other technologies to help adults improve their reading, writing, and math skills. The TLC also provided training in technology and researched and disseminated information about the value of using technology. In Year 1, the TLC took the lead on the two major goals that focused on computer technology issues: (1) to increase the capacity of literacy programs to serve functionally illiterate adults through the use of technology in instruction and management; and (2) to increase literacy programs' abilities to serve functionally illiterate adults through awareness of and access to computer technology, through the development of cooperative networks and statewide collaboration of computer usage.

Before conducting the training, the TLC developed a training design which was based on a needs assessment, survey data, and prior training experience. The plan was expected to maximize the grant award by reaching the greatest number of literacy providers and students.

The technology training, which began in August 1987 at a statewide literacy training gathering, was followed by the formation of an advisory group charged to review the training design, budget, and technology training implementation plan. Technology workshops were held to develop four regional networks to train teachers and volunteers in using technology in literacy instruction.

The MALC staff felt that this component of the project was very successful. During the first year's training workshops, 120 literacy providers were trained of which approximately 100 were teachers in literacy programs. In addition, sessions on technology were held at each of the eight regional workshops held twice a year for the two years of the Gannett Foundation funding. Following the model of "each one teach one," these workshops were often conducted by the individuals trained during the initial year of training. Staff concluded that approximately 480 teachers were trained in technology beyond the initial 100 recipients. Similarly, project goals for training volunteers were also met, and approximately 1,200 students received instruction not previously available.

As referenced in the project's Bonus Grant application, "Technology is having a significant impact in Minnesota's literacy programs." They concluded that the result of the Gannett Foundation funding was to provide programs with timely and useful information to assist them in the decision making process and that the grant was directly responsible for numerous statewide initiatives from the TLC. Developed in part because of the availability of the Literacy Challenge Grant funds, a final document, Use of Technology: Minnesota's Programs, was distributed in late 1990.

A small component of the New Mexico Coalition for Literacy involved the use of computer technology. Among the many activities of the Coalition was the provision of "seed" money and supportive services to several demonstration sites. One of them was the Albuquerque SER-Jobs for Progress, an organization founded to assist economically disadvantaged Hispanics by providing them with GED instruction, job specific skills to ensure job readiness, job placement, and equal opportunity in the workplace.

The project objective involved the utilization of Family Learning Centers (FLC) along with state-of-the-art equipment and approaches to providing literacy instruction to economically disadvantaged Hispanic youth and adults. The FLC's strategy included a combination of computer-assisted instruction, qualified classroom instructors, and other support personnel to deliver quality educational programs, as well as family life services on parenting, drug prevention, immigration, and citizenship.

Within each FLC was a computer-based, flexible system for teaching basic life competencies. The curriculum was individualized, self-paced instruction, delivered in an open-entry, open-exit basis. Diagnostic and mastery tests were used to determine reading level and appropriate program placements.

The two sites with which the Coalition worked, the Alameda Community Center and the Los Padillas Community Center, were in rural/suburban Hispanic communities with significant numbers of high school dropouts. Computer hardware and an autoskills program were obtained for both centers from UNISYS. Each center was equipped with four ICON computers and a desk server.

SER de Albuquerque Family Learning Center submitted a final report on this aspect of the New Mexico project in April 1989.

Another feature of the New Mexico project was its efforts to link far flung programs together via an electronic bulletin board maintained in the Coalition office. (Geographically the fifth largest state in the nation, New Mexico has a small, scattered population of only approximately 1.3 million people.)

Efforts to create the statewide electronic bulletin board were delayed by equipment malfunctions, but the problems were eventually resolved. Bids were solicited for enhanced Coalition computer services, including oversite of a state-funded lease program for literacy program computers in communities requesting them.

Information provided by the Coalition Executive Director in November 1990 indicated that the main limitation of the electronic bulletin board was that very few community-based literacy programs in New Mexico have computers. During the 1989-90 state legislative appropriation funding cycle, personal computers were placed in 10 community-based programs, and 4 more were being placed during the 1990-91 cycle. Independent funding was being sought to purchase modems for these computers. The electronic bulletin board linkage will be accomplished through the State Library system, but the Executive Director reported that the actualization of the network is a still year or two away.

While not a computer technology strategy, the Rhode Island project pursued an unusual technology-based approach (teleconferencing) to reach two target populations which were considered hard-to-reach: public housing residents, and employed unskilled and semiskilled workers. As stated as one of its Year 1 goals, the project attempted to pilot the use of tele-instruction as an additional means of providing literacy instruction. It was thought that if this technique were successful, it would substantially increase the number of clients who could be served at any given time, while decreasing the cost of the service.

Tele-instruction is a technique that uses the telephone system to create a two-way interactive network. The network was formed by joining as many as eight groups ("learning circles") in different locations through the existing telephone system. These locations were linked to an Instructor via a communication "bridge." In addition to connecting several sites simultaneously, the bridge also had the capacity to break down those sites into smaller groups for discussion and problem solving. Learners at the remote sites communicated with the Instructor and other learning sites via a "convener," a device attached to an existing telephone. Learners could hear the instructor's voice and the voices of other learners through a speaker box; they were able to communicate with the network through a microphone. Instruction centered around a set of materials that were provided to the students by their on-site tutor.

The advantages of a tele-instructional network were thought to be: reaching people for whom travel or child care presented barriers to participation; increasing the productivity of an individual teacher by helping him or her serve more people simultaneously; encouraging efficient and effective educational programs because of the extensive and detailed pre-planning required; and structuring a non-threatening learning environment in which adults can use their friendship network as resources for their own learning and moral support.

The proposed project intended to provide training to four tele-instructional classes: two in industry and two in public housing. (See below Section E-3, Workplace Literacy, and above Section E-1, Special Populations—Inner City Residents, for more information on specific project activities associated with these groups.) Each class would consist of 8 sites with 8 to 10 participants at each site. The optimal goal was one instructor providing tele-instruction to anywhere up to 80 students.

Within the public housing units, project staff proposed to work closely with personnel from the Housing Authority to establish and create awareness about the programs and to identify adult nonreaders. A resident from the public housing unit was to be hired and then trained as an instructional tutor. The instructor and the VISTA Volunteers were to train the tutors and be a resource for them throughout the program. The tutor would be on-site at the time of the tele-instruction, would help the students formulate questions for the instructor, and would provide the students with assistance in understanding and completing their assignments.

Within the work sites, major activities were to be conducted by a donated professional staff person from Electric Boat (a large Rhode Island employer). This person was to (1) increase the number of industries providing literacy training for at least eight new industrial-based literacy programs, using the new tele-instructional approach; (2) try to gain a commitment from each industry to match the employees' time in training and provide space for the program; and (3) work with each employer to develop a strategy for recruiting clients. In addition, instructional personnel would be hired to develop curriculum materials tailored to the needs of the workers. Literate volunteers with similar backgrounds and interests were to be trained as tutors by qualified VISTA Volunteers and then to be on-site during, and for a short time after, the time of the tele-instruction to help students understand and complete their assignments.

At the end of two years, the project was able to report only very modest successes in either its public housing initiative or its workplace initiative. As the project relied on the use of tele-instruction as its unique feature, the effectiveness of the overall project depended on the success of the instructional approach for the target population. Unfortunately, the overall system presented some significant difficulties. The strategy required an intervening individual, a "facilitator," who could do both hands-on training with the individuals in a group as well as be responsible for managing the equipment. In theory, the facilitator can be an individual with a lower level of experience than a fully qualified instructor because the "teacher" is electronically "looking over the shoulder" of the facilitator and intervenes with directions or responds to questions from the facilitator.

From the instructor's point of view, a great deal of information is missed in the "bridge" process. What cannot be "seen" by the electronically linked instructor are intangibles such as a confused look, a blank look, a look of incomprehension, or even a look of comprehension. The Adult Education Instructor working with the system regarded the acceptance of this less desirable technology (the tele-instruction itself) by the students as indicative of how determined some of them were to obtain the service (although there was a great deal of difficulty in recruiting students in general). It was assumed in the initial proposal that the students would enjoy using the telephone system. In fact, the students were not "touched" very much by the telephone system, although a facilitator could in theory (and occasionally in practice) "hand over" a student or two to the bridge-based instructor.

Other disadvantages of the system included: having to wait in line to request and receive information; auditory problems, particularly if the student was language or hearing impaired; potential monopoly by the more talkative students; and reliance on the teacher to memorize the voices of the students to give them a sense of personalization. The fact that the information coming over the machine may be competing with the discussion going on within the group means that distraction to the instruction can be very high as well. Language (ESL) difficulties can compound these other problems. In an industrial site with noise already present, the auditory quality would play an important role. And finally, people who cannot read may be more sensitive to "reading" the faces of those to whom they talk; hence, the use of an impersonal machine may be even more onerous to them than to others.

The system can be seen as simply the capacity to conduct conference calls with a teacher at the end of it. The system actually works best on a one-on-one basis. This would suggest that it can be a valuable tool for reaching those individuals who, for whatever reason (small children at home, certain disabilities) cannot physically reach a program. Use of the system could also be helpful in delivering the services to individuals in communities where tutors do not like to travel. Although the Adult Education Instructor had hoped that the availability of the bridge would help address complaints of tutors in far flung places who feel isolated, none used the bridge resource when it was made available to them over an eight-week period. No effort was made to determine why it was not used by the tutors.

3. Workplace Literacy

Several of the Literacy Challenge projects had workplace literacy components. Thirteen of these initiatives were relatively major efforts. Even in other states where workplace initiatives were not significant activities, business representatives frequently sat on Boards of Directors and/or advisory boards.

Workplace literacy became a major component of the Alaska Literacy Challenge Coalition over its two years of Gannett Foundation funding. Alaska's economy was quite unstable at the time of the initial grant application; moreover, according to Alaska's Job Search, 28 percent of those signing up with Job Service did not have a high school education. The state had suffered an economic depression which caused many people to change jobs and careers. The need to re-train and upgrade skills forced many individuals to seek literacy services. Additional business support of Alaska's literacy programs was a goal of the state's PLUS program as well as of the proposal to the Gannett Foundation.

A stated goal of the Coalition was to develop a model workplace literacy program. The company which came forward to participate in a workplace initiative was the Alaska Commercial Company (ACC), an employer with personnel from the areas of the state with the highest illiteracy rates. The ACC had indicated during the first year of the project that it wanted to take a business leadership role in bringing literacy to its workforce. The Company intended to commit release time for workers to tutor as well as for workers to develop literacy skills. The ACC had 19 general stores located all over Alaska in rural areas reachable only through air and water transportation. The Company's managers were making a concerted effort to employ indigenous workers and to provide a management "ladder"; hence, they were particularly interested in bringing literacy opportunities to their employees.

As stated in the proposal:

> The workplace literacy initiative through the Alaska Commercial Company is an historic approach to an historic problem. The problem of adult illiteracy has been a challenge in Alaska's rural areas since Russian Orthodox priests first introduced print

symbols to Yu'Pik speaking Eskimos. Over those two hundred years the general store has been the place where people came to transact business, and to find people who could read and write if they needed those services.

After obtaining a commitment from the President and Human Resource Development Director of the ACC, a plan of action was developed to train store workers. The program was presented to 16 ACC store managers; an initial training took place in the summer of 1988 with representatives from five communities; and a second training took place in the fall.

Unfortunately, very little real progress was made during the Gannett Foundation grant period in bringing literacy activities to the ACC stores. The four stores with which the project was working all fell away. As stated in the final report, "The one store manager who attempted to develop a program was unsuccessful in the promotional effort. Others begged off saying they didn't have time to do the program justice." Nevertheless, at the time of the site visit, staff from both the Coalition and the ACC indicated that they still intended to pursue the initiative. They felt that the previous delays could be attributed to the unusually harsh winters of 1988 and 1989, which prohibited most travel. There was also some thought that perhaps the wrong stores had been selected with which to begin the process. They were continuing to develop the curriculum and were hoping to introduce the program to employees of the Bethel store in the near future.

Some headway had been made with the Carrs and Safeway grocery stores, the second and ninth largest employers in Alaska. A model occupational skills program that included reading instruction for entry level workers at these supermarkets was field-tested successfully. At the end of the project, efforts to involve other corporations in workplace literacy initiatives were met with a "wait and see" attitude. Several businesses expressed interest but then further indicated that they could not make the time available.

Later correspondence (February 1991) with the President of Nine Star Enterprises indicated that, beginning in November 1990, the Alaska Commercial Company did indeed fund training and curriculum development for a workplace literacy program at its Bethel store. Also, Kodiak Island Hospital funded a workplace literacy program for its staff; and the Courtesy Clerk Training Program targeted to workers at the Carrs, Safeway, and Foodland grocery stores has been maintained.

Though not identified as a major goal in either the Year 1 or Year 2 proposals submitted by the Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign (MALC), some efforts were focused on workplace literacy issues. In cooperation with Twin Cities Public Television, MALC sponsored an informational breakfast for business and labor leaders in 1987; more than 100 people attended. Following the breakfast, the Workplace Literacy Task Force was established to raise awareness of literacy needs in the workplace and to encourage business and labor support of literacy services. The Task Force produced a guide entitled "Workplace Literacy: A Blueprint for Action," available in various versions for business/labor or literacy providers. The business/labor version was designed to help employers determine if the basic skills of their workforce need improvement and learn how to develop cooperative literacy programs. The version for literacy providers offers guidelines for working with business and labor in developing actual workplace literacy programs.

Although of interest to the Alabama Literacy Coalition (both of the statewide conferences conducted during the Gannett Literacy Challenge project contained workplace literacy components), business interest remained relatively mild in Alabama. At the time of the site visit, the Russell Corporation was the only employer implementing any new or prototype efforts.

The Delaware Coalition (DCL) indicated its interest in workplace issues in its proposal to the Gannett Foundation, stating "Workplace literacy is a growing concern in Delaware, and more cooperative efforts between adult literacy providers and Business and Industry are needed." DCL sponsored a one-day workplace literacy conference, "Building a Quality Workplace," which brought together corporate representatives with literacy providers, adult literacy students, and in-school, at-risk students. Evaluations of the initiative were very positive.

Workplace literacy was one of four major foci of the Illinois Coalition (ILRDP), a project which was targeted to increasing resources for local and statewide literacy programs. In 1988, the Coalition conducted a statewide survey of adult educators and literacy volunteer programs to determine which were providing services to businesses, industries, and/or labor organizations, and what such services were. They found that services were indeed being provided to more than 100 such entities. They also identified approximately 30 resource experts in Illinois who had experience in developing and implementing workplace literacy programs.

In addition to providing workplace literacy technical assistance workshops and presentations over the two years of the Gannett Foundation grant, the ILRDP co-sponsored the first Chicago Labor Conference for Worker Education in December 1988 (with the Mayor's Office of Employment and Training, the Illinois State Board of Education-Adult Education Section, the Chicago Literacy Coordinating Council, Roosevelt University, and 20 labor unions).

Staff regarded the Marketing Contractual Literacy Services to Business Task Force as the most successful of the Illinois task forces. With the most concrete activities and products, it functioned in a new and exciting developing area of literacy. The Task Force produced a highly regarded Manual (with the same title), and the ILRDP remained involved with workplace literacy issues after the conclusion of the Gannett Foundation grant. A second conference was held with diverse support from sources such as Nabisco, labor unions, LVA, and state agencies.

Indiana was particularly sensitive to the workplace literacy issues in that the Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition was actually created by then Governor Orr in response to a recognition of the impact of adult illiteracy on the state's economic well-being. Indiana's economy, heavily dependent upon manufacturing, had been one of the nation's top producers of steel, automotive components, and other heavy industrial products. In the early 1980s these industries were in serious decline; the technologies and manufacturing processes of the remaining industries needed to be upgraded. Worker skills had to be raised to match the new demands.

Gannett Literacy Challenge grant activities in Indiana only touched on workplace literacy issues: one of the objectives was "to expand efforts to make the general public and business and industry aware of the illiteracy problems and to enlist their support." Workplace literacy remained a high priority of the state, however, as reflected in the establishment in 1989 of an Office of Workforce Literacy to assist employers in establishing literacy efforts.

The Maine Coalition (MSLC) also sought to encourage business and labor to develop on-site literacy programs, identifying this activity as one of its major Year 2 goals. Two significant efforts were made: 1) to increase the number of on-site literacy programs across the state by working with local/regional task forces to make contacts; and 2) to develop promotional materials directly related to business/industry needs. The Coalition sought to expand awareness through various presentations and more than a dozen business breakfasts involving more than 75 businesses. A three-pronged approach evolved in which workshops were developed and presented to groups such as Rotary Clubs, individually targeted businesses, and literacy providers needing assistance in reaching businesses. Eventually, more than 750 businesses were made aware of adult literacy issues through these approaches. Approximately 20 businesses added on-site programs for approximately 500 employees. Various handbooks and other materials were developed to aid in the development of on-site programs.

At the time of the site visit, staff from MSLC were engaged in concrete, local efforts associated with workplace literacy including work with a group of gas stations to provide literacy training to employees. Indicating that it continued to regard in-service training as a high priority, the Coalition focused on helping employers in the banking and paper industries.

The Massachusetts Coalition for Adult Literacy (MCAL) had a major set of activities associated with workplace literacy. As stated in the original proposal:

> Massachusetts educators, employers, and public officials have become increasingly concerned about the impact of insufficient education on the quality of life in the Commonwealth. This concern has been the driving force behind the current commitment of the public and private sectors to ensure that every adult in Massachusetts has the opportunity to obtain the education he or she needs to participate fully in the community.

Throughout 1988, the Coalition's Public Policy Committee and the Executive Director worked with the Governor's Commonwealth Literacy Corps (CLC) on coordinating a statewide campaign in support of the Massachusetts Long-Term Workforce Strategy, a statewide, comprehensive plan for adult literacy, training, and employment programs. MCAL also wrote and advocated for House Bill 2983, which was based on this strategy. MCAL obtained 51 legislative co-sponsors for the bill which proposed, for the first time, statutory language requiring the Commonwealth to be responsible to educate residents to a high school credentialing level regardless of age.

MCAL also sought to increase the participation of business, trade, service, labor, and community leaders in the Coalition's public information and awareness network by recruiting them for activities such as participation on various Coalition subcommittees. The Coalition co-sponsored business and labor breakfasts with the PLUS Task Force, including one at which Governor Dukakis spoke to an audience of 255 key business and labor leaders.

Although not specifically identified as a goal or major activity in its proposals to the Gannett Foundation, workplace literacy activities emerged as significant components of the Pennsylvania State Coalition for Adult Literacy (PSCAL). The development occurred, in part, because Gannett Foundation funds were used as part of a "match" to draw down a much larger sum from the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce. These funds were used to develop videotape and print training materials for providers and local coalitions (a target of the Gannett Foundation funded activities) on how to design basic skills instruction for a workplace or job training setting.

In late 1987, the PSCAL Board and staff, in concert with the Adult Literacy Institute, developed the idea of a "technical assistance cadre" who were to be well trained and experienced professionals in the area of workplace education. Primary funding to support this group, eventually called "WorkTAP" (Workplace Literacy Technical Assistance Program), came from the Division of ABE, 310 Special Projects funding. A WorkTAP brochure described it as follows: "WorkTAP consultants help employers define needs and explore options; identify appropriate adult educators to work with them; train adult educators to deliver job specific basic skills instruction; assist in program design and implementation; and link them to other needed resources."

Dr. Gary Geroy, also from Pennsylvania State University, was selected to train the WorkTAP consultants and to develop materials for their training workshops. Two products emerged from this effort: Upgrading Basic Skills for the Workplace is a manual documenting the step-by-step approach to developing, marketing, and implementing workplace literacy programs; "A Literate Workforce: Meeting the Needs" is its associated videotape.

WorkTAP and PSCAL presented technical assistance workshops for local coalitions. The locals were invited to attend in threesomes: service providers, business and industry representatives, and job training/welfare representatives. A second year of funding from the Pennsylvania Department of Education expanded the capabilities of WorkTAP by training members of local coalitions as WorkTAP consultants. Using a competitive RFP process, eight local coalitions were awarded funding to cover the cost of training plus twelve days of WorkTAP consultation. Those coalition members who received WorkTAP training, in turn, trained other members of their coalition to work within the community to develop workplace literacy programs.

Unfortunately, neither PSCAL nor the Institute collected or kept data on the numbers of people trained or the numbers of resultant local workplace programs. Some anecdotal information was contained in reports from local coalitions and in various print materials. For example, it was reported that one local coalition worked with a company to prepare adults to pass the General Aptitude Test Battery needed for employment; that labor organizations were represented in many local coalitions as were agencies and programs serving the employment needs of special population groups; and that migrant and Hispanic programs were becoming more active in some coalitions. Industry and labor involvement differed from community to community; staff believed that it was greater in the urban areas. The PSCAL itself and the Institute occasionally worked directly with employers. However, in general, at the time of the site visit, there was no ongoing, institutionalized relationship in place with the business and labor community or key spokesperson to serve as the focal point for such an initiative.

The Tennessee Literacy Coalition (TLC) sought to reach small employers through production and dissemination of a brochure entitled "Literacy is Everybody's Business" aimed at the business community. Printed in the fall of 1988, it was made available to local literacy programs for distribution to businesses within their communities. During the second year of Gannett Foundation grant activity, the TLC sponsored a competition with a prize of $500, to be awarded to companies interested in setting up a group tutoring program in a workplace setting. Two grants were awarded in December 1988: (1) A program at Murray-Ohio in Lawrenceburg, serving 16 students, which provided two structured classes, and volunteers available on an as-needed, individual basis; and (2) a project at Elm Hill Meats in Lenoir City, serving five students taught as a group, with supplemental tutoring from volunteers. Unfortunately, at the time of the site visit, TLC staff indicated that the workplace literacy pilot projects had not worked as well as hoped. There was speculation that this may have been because there was too little money involved to be a real incentive. Although two programs received awards, selection was limited as the contest itself yielded few responses.

Nevertheless, the TLC project credited its efforts over a two-year period for the initiation of approximately 35 workplace literacy programs throughout the state involving approximately 1,050 employees.

Workplace literacy was a topic of interest to the Nevada Literacy Coalition from its inception as reflected by the fact that the establishment of a Workforce Literacy Task Force was one of its first activities. Nevada had only a four percent unemployment rate; hence, there was significant interest on the part of many employers in retaining their existing workforce. Upgrading workforce skills was seen as both an enhancement attraction for the workers and a solution to problems associated with increased automation and technology requiring higher literacy levels. As reported in its second-year proposal, business involvement for workplace literacy increased with active support by casinos in both the northern and southern areas of Nevada.

The development of a strategic plan for business and industry literacy support was a primary goal of second-year activities. An Advisory Board member from IBM was named chair of the Business and Industry Literacy Program Planning Committee, which worked to develop a master plan for the business community. Literacy awareness events for business and industry in northern and southern Nevada were coordinated with the Private Industry Council, Western Industrial Nevada, and the Governor's recognition business luncheons. The Coalition also sought to increase partnership activities among business/industry, the Department of Education, and JTPA; these activities were targeted to increasing technology-assisted literacy programs in communities and in the state prison system.

The Rhode Island project initiated a very interesting approach to workplace literacy; one of its major first-year goals was to increase substantially the number of adults receiving job-related literacy training at their work site. Specific activities identified for pursuit included the development of materials for tele-instruction for industry-based clients; recruitment and training of tutors and students; the recruitment of industry-based and AFL-CIO sites, the provision of tele-instructional classes and support tutoring for two industry and labor-based groups of clients; and the eventual dissemination of the program to additional industry-based and AFL-CIO sites. The project proposed the use of peers as tutors and tele-instructional equipment to augment the learning process.

The project was designed to take place in the environment which is most familiar to the client and most easily accessible, "the industry at which the client works." As stated in the proposal:

> The majority of unskilled laborers have the same fear as the public housing residents of returning to a classroom setting. They have the added barrier of embarrassment of admitting, often to peers and employers whom they have successfully deceived in the past, that they cannot read or write.

A major employer in Rhode Island, the Electric Boat Division of General Dynamics Corporation, agreed to take the lead in this initiative by providing the project with the donated services of a member of its professional staff. This person's charge was to substantially increase the number of industries providing literacy training; to gain a commitment from each participating industry to match the time the employee agreed to put into the program, and to provide space for the program before and after working hours. This loaned professional had the further responsibility for working with each industry to develop a strategy for recruiting clients including being sensitive to the fears and embarrassment the worker might feel by admitting to having a low level of literacy.

Instructional personnel would then be hired to develop curriculum materials tailored to the needs of the workers in order for them to be able to advance on the job and be better prepared for the workforce of the future. The model called for literate volunteers with similar backgrounds and interest to be trained as tutors by qualified VISTA Volunteers. These tutors would be on-site during the time of the tele-instruction and for a short time beyond to help clients understand and complete their assignments. Tele-instruction would take place twice weekly, 2 1/2 hours for 45 weeks (3 semesters).

In its Year 2 proposal, the Rhode Island project re-committed its energies to its Year 1 goals while indicating its intention to concentrate more attention on increasing the number of industry-based learning circles by eight (as well as new learning circles in eight additional public housing projects).

Unfortunately, participation from the labor and business/industry sectors did not materialize as expected. Although the AFL-CIO had agreed to use this business model to recruit and train members of their affiliates who have literacy needs, the AFL-CIO linkage did not develop. Although three companies did participate, it was only on a one-time basis. The Electric Boat Company, which had indicated an early interest in the initiative, did not become actively engaged. Staff were at a loss to explain the Company's change of heart.

In its initial proposal, the Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy (WACAL) also identified workplace literacy as one of its four major objectives. WACAL proposed to develop a demonstration project involving private business in the creation and implementation of literacy services, with the specific goal of involving at least one private business in offering literacy services by April 1988. The goal was twofold: to directly assist persons (employees and possibly others) in need of literacy assistance, and to field test an approach which, it was hoped, would be expandable and could be replicated. In the project's Year 2 proposal, proposed activities and objectives included (1) fostering the involvement of business and existing literacy programs in developing workforce literacy programs; and (2) providing a liaison between the business community and existing literacy service providers, which would facilitate the development of workforce literacy programs. The overall plan was to recruit additional businesses once the program model was developed and tested.

The initial plan included the accumulation of resource materials on workplace literacy; a survey of 50 literacy providers around the state to assess the state of existing business-related efforts; and the compilation of a directory (to be periodically updated and distributed) of businesses which had supported literacy in some manner. In retrospect, this effort was premature as only one business/literacy relationship met the criteria; as a result, the directory was never developed. In spite of this disappointment, staff continued their efforts to develop resources and expertise to help literacy providers and businesses begin the process of developing workforce literacy programs.

To further this endeavor, in November 1987, staff convened the "Literacy for a More Productive Workforce" conference, held in cooperation with the Western Washington PLUS Task Force, Washington Literacy, the Governor's Office, and representatives of Washington's business, labor, and government sectors. The goals of the conference were to inform private businesses about the impact of adult illiteracy on the state economic picture and on the individual; acquaint decision makers with available resources; and encourage groups to work together to find solutions. Although the conference was well attended (by approximately 94 individuals), little progress was made in developing a specific new demonstration project. They attributed this situation to the embryonic nature of workplace literacy awareness and interest in the state.

In the second year, WACAL staff directed their efforts at building awareness, collecting resource materials on workplace literacy, and surveying literacy providers to determine the extent of existing business involvement with literacy programs. The "Business and Literacy Project Resource List" was developed from these sources and made available in August 1988; a second edition was updated and reformatted in 1989. This component of the initiative eventually receded to simply responding to requests for information. Staff developed a fee structure to respond to larger, more formal requests for workforce support and/or technical assistance, but no such requests were forthcoming. Washington Literacy, which took over the initiative after the Gannett Foundation-funded activities ended, also attempted to establish a fee structure, but again there was no significant interest in purchasing the service.

In concluding its review of its workplace activities, WACAL staff indicated that the need for a stand-alone, exclusively workforce-focused project had diminished; they suggested that Washington Literacy (a member of the Coalition) incorporate workforce literacy project functions into existing or new staff positions and begin service provision on a fee-for-service basis. At the time of the site visit, staff indicated one of their greatest disappointments had been their inability to develop a private business initiative.

In a different slant, WACAL targeted funds and activities in Year 2 to secure union involvement with the initiative. The Year 2 proposal stated:

> Our efforts during the first grant year focused on the business community. To round out these efforts, we are actively seeking ways to inform and involve labor unions. Because of the number and diversity of unions, we believe that we can be most effective by targeting an industry or large union, getting them involved, and publicizing their efforts in order to encourage other union involvement.

Although staff sent a survey to various unions seeking interest, only a few responded. Little momentum was created, and eventually staff drifted away from the initiative. As a joint effort between WACAL and the Washington State Labor Council, however, a small document was developed entitled Workforce Literacy: The Role of Organized Labor, which contained a survey designed to gauge the labor community's perception of basic skills needs among unionized members of the workforce. The document was sent from the State Labor Council to its mailing list of 2,000, but, again, the results were negligible. The only other tangible outcomes of the union initiative were (1) an article placed in the HERE (Hotel Employees, Restaurant Employees) Local 8 union newsletter, aimed at literacy students among the union membership; and (2) expansion of the Business and Literacy Project library to include publications with union perspectives on training and education.

Despite the disappointment about this effort, some staff expressed optimism at the time of the site visit as a result of the new Governor's initiative in workforce training and retraining. A new program, "Investment in Human Capital," had been passed and funded by the State Legislature, and there were plans to conduct a workplace literacy needs study that might result in pilot projects. (According to April 1991 correspondence from the Coalition, this study was conducted by the Battelle Institute and Washington State University for the Governor's Office. The pilot projects that were funded are being housed at community colleges.)

The experiences of WACAL's efforts to develop workplace initiatives were best summarized by staff (and reported in some detail here, as they are reflective of the experiences and frustrations of others who voiced similar concerns) as follows:

> Follow-up with both employers and service providers has been more difficult than anticipated, even though in many cases contact has been initiated by others, and even though the Project has offered materials and information on a continuous basis at no cost. There may be several reasons for this. From the business perspective, it takes a very long time for ideas to be implemented, especially if they involve revision of training materials and extensive involvement of staff. Businesses often consider their testing and training information proprietary, and are not willing to share that information with outsiders. They are concerned with legal liability regarding screening, and there also appears to be some defensiveness and fear of being told they're not doing enough. Some companies are wary of publicizing their programs, lest employees see them as self-serving, and some are unwilling to consider programs once they realize it will cost time and money. There seems to be a normal progression wherein the Project and other sources are consulted during the early information-gathering phase. It then takes a long time for a company to decide what to do with the information, and, if they decide to implement a program, the Project might not necessarily be informed about it.
>
> In terms of literacy service providers, a major factor is lack of time, staff, and funds to respond to others beyond their own funding sources and managers. Sometimes politics and competition are factors in their reluctance to let others know about their partnerships with business.

4. Welfare Reform and Literacy

Some project staff expressed concerns about the impact of welfare reform efforts, particularly with regard to the infusion of public assistance recipients who have been mandated to participate in programs. The fear is that these students, entering the system with different motivations than those of "traditional" literacy students, will tax the resources and abilities of existing tutor, trainer, and teacher systems.

For example, staff associated with the Kentucky project expressed concerns about the inherent differences and potential strains between literacy efforts driven by an educational orientation and those driven by an economic development orientation. Many of the Kentucky students and volunteers were individuals who had non-economic motivations for becoming literate, such as desiring to read the Bible. Staff worried that individuals who come to adult literacy through the traditional routes would be squeezed out if scarce resources were "targeted" for economic reasons to specific populations. Particularly vulnerable in such a scenario would be the elderly and those in isolated, rural communities.

The Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy (WACAL) reported a small foray into welfare reform and literacy. In response to a Coalition member (representing the Department of Employment Security), staff from WACAL addressed two training groups of service-providing contractors for the Family Independence Program (FIP) to advise them on identification of and assistance to clients with literacy problems. The FIP is a state program aimed at getting families off welfare by removing barriers to employment. WACAL concluded that there was a need for state-level coordination of written materials from the Department of Social and Health Services and Employment Security, to make the materials more accessible to their intended audience, which is more likely to have literacy problems than other segments of the population. Staff concluded, however, that movement in this area has been slow.

Applying stringent sanctions against those not complying with welfare reform regulations, the city of Minneapolis in 1990 prioritized approximately 400 of its lowest literacy functioning adults (of approximately 2,000 public assistance recipients) and required their enrollment in "work readiness" programs. It will be worth watching this "experiment" in how a literacy system adapts to the sudden presence of non-voluntary students.

In correspondence at the end of the Gannett Foundation grant, the Alabama project director indicated that the Coalition is working with the State Department of Human Resources to plan to accommodate welfare mothers in literacy programs "when the new welfare legislation goes into effect."

5. Family Literacy

Although not defined at the time as a "family literacy" effort, the Alaska Coalition sought to develop within the State Library Division a model delivery of the Parents and Tots Reading Program for literacy instruction. The Parents and Tots Reading Program combines adult education for parents and school readiness for children. While parents work one-to-one with trained peer tutors at their local library, their children attend a story hour. When the hour is up, parents and children sit down together, and the parents read their children a book.

The Parents and Tots Reading Program was developed by the Literacy Council of Alaska and the Fairbanks North Star Borough Library Foundation through funds from the State Library Foundation and the Fairbanks North Star Borough Library Foundation. The Alaska Coalition requested Literacy Challenge funds to develop and field test a model delivery of the program; develop a training "kit" to be made available to librarians; present the Parents and Tots Reading Program at Train the Trainers workshops and at major Alaska education conferences; and disseminate materials and books for the Program. In the second year of the project, staff sought to expand upon these same activities. They hoped to see the program developed in at least 20 libraries.

The Parents and Tots model was introduced at two statewide conferences and presented at each of the three Train the Trainers workshops conducted by project staff.

Despite the extensive work which had been done on this reading program, and the visibility which the Literacy Challenge Coalition staff tried to give to it, few new programs actually developed. None of the materials were in use at the time of the site visit. Staff were at a loss to explain why the program failed to take hold other than to speculate that the library system, through which the program was to be provided, never seemed to regard it as "their own" and hence largely ignored its availability. Library commitment at the state level was not in place when the proposals were developed and did not emerge during the grant periods.

Correspondence subsequent to the site visit indicated that funding for the Parents and Tots Program has been a problem since 1986. Nevertheless, the materials are fully developed, have demonstrated success, and are being used in other states as the basis of family literacy projects. They remain for sale through the Alaska Literacy Council.

As stated in its proposal, the Delaware Coalition for Literacy intended to develop an intergenerational literacy model with a curriculum, objectives, and strategies. One to three sites were to be selected for field testing. The result was Project BOND, the goals of which were to help nonreading adults develop and improve reading skills, and to facilitate the creation of bonds between parents and children through reading activities.

Project BOND was designed to be offered over a 12-month period in 6-week modules. High interest, low level adult literature is the focus of the first meeting of each week. A book, short story, or short novel served as a non-threatening impersonal tool to bring about open discussions and to facilitate planned activities. Emphasis was placed on the content of the reading while basic skills were being developed. Curriculum and field testing occurred during the project year. DCL staff commented in closing correspondence with the Gannett Foundation that the curriculum developed on Project BOND had led to an award from the federal "Even Start" program, and that funding for a second project had been requested.

The Nevada Literacy Coalition (NLC) began to focus some of its attention in its second year on family literacy. In 1988, its Publicity Committee merged with the PLUS Publicity Task Force. The PLUS Publicity Plan involved a broad spectrum of the community (media, libraries, schools, churches, etc.) in a coordinated effort to promote family literacy in Nevada. Several special campaigns and events were conducted, such as Read-A-Thons and Read-Ins at shopping malls, contests involving youth and families, and programs in schools and libraries. Readers' Theater contests were also conducted in major shopping malls in Reno and Las Vegas in 1989 and 1990. Family literacy was also promoted through churches (literacy packets were given to clergymen, who encouraged parishioners to become involved in local literacy efforts, and the Lutheran Social Ministry initiated and publicized literacy programs involving Las Vegas parishioners); and through supermarkets (grocery bags were printed with messages and graphics to promote reading).

One of the objectives of the NLC was to create targeted outreach programs to prevent illiteracy among future Nevadans, such as parents of children in Head Start and new parents using the services of hospital wards. In June 1987, such a program was initiated in Las Vegas. Through this program, called "Catch Them in the Cradle," literacy information was distributed to the parents of newborns. No information was collected as to its impact.

Toward the end of the Gannett Foundation grant period, the Illinois Literacy Resource Development Project (ILRDP) developed an interest in family literacy issues. ILRDP was subsequently funded by the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation to (1) survey and then document the family literacy programs in the state; (2) develop several formative, self-administered evaluation tools for family literacy provider agencies; (3) develop a family literacy curriculum resources manual; and (4) facilitate statewide coordination of family literacy programs and initiatives.

CHAPTER THREE

Discussion

"These grants reward collaboration in making practical efforts to teach adults the basic reading skills everyone needs. The purpose of the projects is not just to generate temporarily increased activity, but to establish lasting mechanisms for providing literacy services."

Tom Curley, President,
USA TODAY

A. The Process

It should be noted that this Report can only present a "snapshot" of where the projects were at a certain point in time. Generally, the last communications with project staffs were at the time they reviewed the draft documents for the Individual Project Reports. Several projects supplied additional information (sometimes including post-Gannett Foundation activities) which was integrated into the Individual Project Reports. In some cases, post-project communication was with the same individuals initially associated with the Literacy Challenge projects; in other cases (usually where the Coalition was no longer functioning), individuals who had not been associated with the original initiatives supplied the information.

As explained previously, results and findings presented in this Report are based primarily on material acquired from the projects themselves through written reports and correspondence and site visit interviews. For the most part, we have accepted the "face value" of such information. When discrepancies were found, usually between original project objectives and subsequent achievements, they were noted in the Individual Project Reports and are repeated in this Report.

Throughout the life of the Literacy Challenge projects, and for this Report, attempts were made to collect information from the coalitions as to "numbers": how many individuals attended the conferences, workshops and training sessions; how many copies of the newsletters were distributed; how many calls came into the hotlines, and of these, how many were potential students and how many potential tutors; how many were referred, and to whom or what program; how many follow-up calls were made and what did they discover; how many times were the public television and radio spots run; how many fliers were distributed at how many sites; how many speeches were made; and what impact did any of these activities have on the number of adults gaining literacy skills? All these numbers (and more) have been sought, and whenever possible, included in the Individual State Reports; they are further summarized and presented throughout this Report, and they are listed in detail in Appendix B.

As stated frequently to the project directors, the ultimate goal of the Gannett Foundation was the expansion of adult literacy systems. Unified leadership and improved effectiveness were regarded as two key tools. Gannett staff developed a standardized "Impact Report" specifically to collect information about policy and system activities, which each of the projects was asked to complete. Information included accomplishments related to system capacity and size, outreach, and the permanence and quality of programs. Project directors were asked to collect such information.

For example, for those with relatively straightforward objectives, such as helping to organize local programs, training local trainers, providing information and referral, etc., it was pointed out that these efforts should result in more services for adult learners. Such results would be quantifiable if appropriate records were developed and maintained. Projects designed to help local providers diversify their services could also be measured in terms of the number of learners who received services and who would not have received them otherwise. Reduction in turnover of volunteers and tutors would help expand the system by letting future recruitment focus on adding rather than replacing participants—again, producing numbers which would show the systemic impact of the projects.

By the spring of 1988 Gannett Foundation staff had developed "project descriptions," including the kinds of "products" to be generated by each of the projects. Information was being collected through the impact reports. It was hoped that this standardized information would clarify the projects' impact on system capacity and size, outreach, permanence, and quality of the programs.

Nevertheless, for the most part, numbers reported by the projects are particularly "soft" in that there was no way to make independent assessments of the accuracy of the state-supplied data; and also in that the capacity of the various statewide systems to collect and analyze numbers varied significantly from state to state, ranging from states where virtually no firm data were collected, such as Mississippi and Alabama, to states with comprehensive computer-based systems in place, such as Indiana and Minnesota. Without a comprehensive statewide data collection capacity, no solid conclusions can be made regarding literacy efforts or even the full impact of the Literacy Challenge grant activities. Further, as is well known, the adult literacy systems are inherently complex, with many forms and levels of service delivery. Keeping track of the various programs and their activities is a major undertaking.

Another complicating factor is that what in fact one finds "in the field" is that the collection of numbers is not high on anyone's list. Adult literacy service providers (like almost all other service providers), almost by temperament, are not much interested in, or impressed by, numbers. Record keeping is laborious and nowhere near so gratifying as providing a service to a willing and eager student or tutor. Hence, even with the best of intentions, and knowing that the collection of "hard" information was important to the Gannett Foundation, most of the projects fell behind on their data collection efforts.

In many instances the Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge projects were not able to meet all of the goals and objectives which they had set for themselves. Although understanding these shortfalls is not for the faint of heart, learning from the "failures" is as important as learning from the "successes," and hence both are included in the Individual Project Reports and in this Report.

In a few cases, there were significant discrepancies between reported successful accomplishments and the realities which appeared in subsequent correspondence or during the site visit. While information provided on paper can be obfuscating, individuals in a face-to-face interview responding to direct questions are more likely to give direct answers; hence, site visits to projects can play an important role for a funding source to really know what is going on inside an initiative. Such discrepancies, when found, are noted in this Report and in the Individual Project Reports; why they occurred, if known, is also reported. It can be said in general, however, that most of the proposed activities and goals were responsibly pursued by the projects; and that, even in many cases where not all goals and objectives were met, staff made good faith efforts to meet their contractual obligations.

It should be noted that the Gannett Foundation staff were diligent in reaching out to the project directors through frequent letters and memos as well as through the convening of the total group on three occasions, in August and November 1987 and August 1988.

B. Influencing Variables

1. Diversity of Aspirations and Achievements

As stated in correspondence from Christy Bulkeley in December 1990: "I continue to be mystified at how to explain the vibrancy, the substance, the difference among these [projects]...then I remember the bulbs I plant...needing to put down roots...one starting from a big bulb, one from a handful of seeds."

Among the most striking aspects of the overall Literacy Challenge grants program was the sheer diversity of the initiatives undertaken by the statewide coalitions. (See Appendix A for a comprehensive listing of all projects' goals and objectives.) This diversity in approach obviously led to even greater diversity in results. Outcomes were influenced by many variables. Of major importance was the magnitude of the complexity, the "stretch" of the initial effort; that is, many of the states proposed generic goals for which they could subsequently claim success, such as "expansion of awareness of adult literacy," "enhanced networking activities," and "increasing student and tutor involvement." Given the availability of the Gannett Foundation targeted funds for one or two years, it was not hard to reflect progress in meeting goals such as these. Other aspirations, however, were not so easily attained or demonstrated.

For example, the Indiana project (IALC) attempted several interesting "risky" ventures. One was to develop a quality control process over the use of its "Research Cadre," a compiling of literacy experts who could be accessed to provide consultant, supportive services. The concept of the Resource Cadre itself was a targeted effort to expand the resources available to the growing number of local coalitions which were developing in Indiana. Included in the plans of the Coalition was the collection of information which would allow them to eventually evaluate the quality and cost of the services being provided by the Cadre members. They hoped to be able to apply some standards and guidelines to the fees charged, and the quality of services provided. In the long run, this proved impractical, primarily because they did not have any formal authority to require the information from either the provider or the recipient of services, or to regulate the fee structure being used by any individual. The IALC was able to computerize the Cadre database and has further refined it in terms of the categories under which services and Cadre members are listed.

Similarly, the Indiana project hoped to develop a "model coalition" as a guide for the formation of new local initiatives. They developed some criteria and materials but never completed or demonstrated such a model. Staff indicated that it was impossible to further the initiative beyond a certain point because they had no real leverage (or incentive) to push its adoption among programs. Attempts to "persuade" programs to follow the "model" were not particularly successful.

And finally, an ambitious evaluation and database plan proposed by the IALC was derailed by political decisions outside the project's sphere of influence. (This is discussed in more detail below in Section C, Operating Environments.)

All three of these initiatives reflected initial staff optimism about their ability to accomplish complicated and difficult tasks. They were not alone in "biting off more than they could chew," but like many others who did, they nevertheless accomplished a great deal. (See Appendix B.) And they learned lessons from what did not work as well as from what did.

Assessing the relative "successes" and "failures" of the projects must take into consideration the differences in the "risk" factor undertaken by some of the projects compared to others. Similar to the issue discussed above, not only were some of the specific goals of some projects less "standard" than others, but an additional element of uncertainty was introduced when the focus was, for example, upon hard-to-reach populations using nontraditional methods of outreach. Both Rhode Island and Connecticut attempted to reach high-risk populations through unconventional, unusual efforts; both were able to achieve some successes but were stymied in their overall efforts. New Mexico, which was somewhat more successful in its efforts to reach Indian pueblo populations, also had its problems.

Yet another important factor was the complexity of the state activities themselves. That is, in some of the states, adult literacy was itself a relatively embryonic or small effort. Hence, the infusion of the Gannett Foundation funds represented a major "shot in the arm," the effects of which were readily discernible. Such projects included New Mexico, Mississippi, Alabama, and Puerto Rico. In other states, such as California, Washington, and Minnesota, the adult literacy system was well established and complex at the time of the Literacy Challenge. New York, for example, had multiple funding sources, a range of institutions offering literacy services, a wide variety of programs designs and instructional approaches, and a diverse student population.

The environment in New York State differed from most of the other states in the extensiveness of literacy-related activity and awareness which already existed at the time of the proposal. Unlike others, there was little interest in "expanding awareness," "program expansion," or "expanding resources" as primary goals, since it was believed that other efforts had already made significant progress toward these goals. Rather, the project sought to influence public policy at the state level through the articulation of goals and objectives for literacy development, identified through a "grassroots" process. Hence, the activities of the project were quite concrete: convening of local caucuses, leading to a statewide convention, and the development of a set of prioritized recommendations for future activities. Less concrete (and less successful) was the expectation that the outcome of this process (the recommendations themselves) would influence policy makers at the state level.

Virtually without exception, the recipients of the Gannett Foundation grants felt that the funds had been instrumental in allowing the state to make significant strides in developing adult literacy services. Even in states where adult literacy was relatively well established, as in Indiana, staff indicated that the impact of the grant had provided a major "boost" to the adult literacy system.

2. Real and Perceived Barriers

Virtually all of the states felt uniquely burdened by both real and perceived geographic barriers to reaching tutors and students. For example, Tennessee is "composed of three regions and Nashville." Illinois is Chicago plus everywhere else. Nevada is Reno, Las Vegas, and everywhere else. In some instances, these differences are reflective of rural versus urban conditions. In Illinois, for example, there is a sense that Chicago has substantially different problems than those faced by virtually every other area in the state. Among the states most troubled by the impact of geographic and regional (and population) differences was Alaska. It is not surprising that in Alaska the weather also played a major role in what is or is not accomplished.

These differences and challenges were particularly revealed by the Gannett Foundation requirement that the projects be statewide in nature. It is interesting to note in the proposal materials how frequently these statewide initiatives were described by the proposal writers as "first time" efforts, or efforts which had been preceded by failed efforts. The popularity of some of the more generic tasks and activities, such as the development of provider directories, hotlines, and newsletters, reflects the difficulty of transferring sophisticated technology and/or techniques from community to community.

State lines have an arbitrary and capricious quality, not necessarily reflective of the similarities or differences of the people living within those lines. Hence, the needs of individuals living in a rural section of Kentucky may be far more similar to those of a rural section of Tennessee than to those of their fellow Kentucky citizen living in Frankfort (the site of the Kentucky Foundation for Literacy, Inc.) Hence, it may be more reasonable to stress statewide initiatives for some specific tasks while recognizing that statewide application of others may be neither reasonable nor successful.

In those instances in which the goals of the project were more modest in geographic intent, as for example Connecticut, other dangers were present. At least a statewide effort can command the notice of powerful influences and bring considerable attention to the intention of the effort even if it is less than successful. Projects operating on a smaller level within cities or communities can easily be lost and/or ignored.

Other types of barriers and limitations were identified by the projects. These included (1) individual differences among various literacy providers which affected their ability and/or willingness to access and use training and materials; (2) the high costs of developing, reproducing, and disseminating materials (particularly videotapes); and (3) difficulties in accomplishing curricula development within project time frames.

3. The Role of Individuals

The dedication and skills of board and staff members played a significant role in all of the projects funded by the Gannett Foundation. Individual leadership played a major role in the ability to garner support from senior government officials, volunteers, and community organizations such as churches, corporations, and small businesses. The role of the project directors was particularly challenging in that they had to pursue funds as well as conduct project activities.

There were instances in which those individuals who had been responsible for the preparation of a funded proposal were "lost" somewhere along the way, either voluntarily or as a result of changes outside of their control. When an individual who has been critical to the conduct of a project is no longer involved, it can affect the overall fate of the project. In New Mexico, for example, the loss of the original project director was mitigated by two factors—her replacement with someone who had been associated with the initiative during the outgoing director's tenure; and the ongoing stability of the Board of Directors. In Indiana, where there also had been a turnover of individuals associated with the project, the "vision" of the original initiators had been successfully passed onto the subsequent leadership. Hence, although the proposal writers were no longer on the scene, remaining staff attributed the relative stability and solidity of the Coalition to the strength of the original developers. In the case of Nevada, loss of the original project director resulted in a slowdown of project activity, although the new project director was on board at the time of the site visit. In other cases, for example Rhode Island, loss of the project director resulted in a significant loss in the activity level of the project; and in at least one case, Washington, the staff turnover resulted in changes in the commitments to, and priorities of, the project.

4. Goals and Fundraising

There was one basic discrepancy between the goals and objectives of the Foundation and the activities believed by the projects to be most important. The goals and objectives of the Foundation were most clearly stated in the remarks made at the time of the first awards by individuals such as Eugene Dorsey and Tom Curley, and by the language used in the Gannett Foundation news releases announcing the awards. These Foundation goals can best be summarized as "to establish lasting mechanisms for providing literacy services; to develop innovative state-level projects to permanently expand adult literacy services; and to make adult literacy services and resources permanently available in all parts of a state." It is also accurate to say that these goals associated with permanent system expansion were emphasized in writing and verbally on several occasions by Gannett Foundation staff. Even in the last concluding correspondence associated with the announcement of the Bonus Grants, projects were reminded: "Remember, the result we are looking for is permanent expansion of the adult literacy system and involvement of more volunteers with it."

Nevertheless, in many cases, this directive for long-term, permanent expansion became secondary to the pressing daily needs and challenges of the projects. The complexity of tasks which any successful project needed to accomplish was daunting: board development and nurturance; resolution of coalition "turf" issues; staff and consultant management and maintenance; specific project tasks; fundraising; dealing with "political" issues; personalities...the list goes on and on. Small wonder that some of the projects were not able to keep all of these "balls" juggled in the air. In some cases a lapse meant a goal or objective was not achieved. In other cases, where fundraising and resource development were not aggressively pursued, the ability of the initiative itself to survive was damaged, sometimes fatally.

No other issue was as important to each project as the resolution of its future funding base. And yet several of the projects operated as though funding would somehow emerge if they merely successfully accomplished their project goals and objectives. Moreover, the assertive fundraising and resource development efforts which are usually necessary to obtain funding (from either public or private sources) require skills which some of the project staff did not possess. In other words, many (if not most) of the projects did not contain an entrepreneurial element. Even in those cases where materials or skills had been developed which could be marketed, there was little success in doing so.

One of the outcomes which the Gannett Foundation was particularly interested in seeing developed within the projects was their capacity to develop services and products for which at least a partial fee could be charged. Through such reimbursement, it was hoped that several of the projects could become more self-sufficient and less dependent upon outside funding. All of the projects were verbally encouraged to pursue this strategy, and some held significant potential for doing so. Those which seemed most likely to be successful were (1) projects with unique program components potentially transferable to other sites (such as Connecticut and Rhode Island); (2) those with strong training and/or technical assistance capacities from which other sites could learn (such as Minnesota); and (3) those which developed strong documents and materials (such as Illinois and Kentucky).

The Illinois Literacy Resource Development Project (ILRDP) did indeed develop products (four major "how to" manuals) with an eye to eventual revenue, both from sales and from fees charged for the technical assistance which they hoped to provide in concert with the manuals. Despite the fact that their prices were reasonable ($12 for three of the manuals and $15 for the fourth, the business-related manual), there was only modest success in selling the documents (marketed mostly by making them available at conferences and advertising through newsletters). Staff did not consider or pursue the possibility of marketing the manuals through a commercial publisher. This was indeed unfortunate for others outside the state (the materials were extensively distributed within Illinois), as the materials were extremely well done and potentially useful. As in other states, the market for fee-based technical assistance adult literacy services had not developed in Illinois.

The Massachusetts project (MCAL) identified the increase and broadening of its financial base as a primary objective in its second year of funding. Among other strategies (for example, approaching foundations and writing proposals), the Coalition concentrated on recruitment campaigns, with the hope of expanding membership to a minimum of 1,500 individual, family, program, agency, and corporate members. The plan was to provide membership categories with different benefits associated with different levels of financial sponsorship. Unfortunately, while membership was increased over the two years of the Gannett Foundation funding (from approximately 300 to approximately 500), revenue generated by the average $10 dues fee (reduced even lower for students) was inadequate to sustain program activity.

Basically, with only a few exceptions, the hope of the Gannett Foundation that the projects would move in the direction of fees, associated with services, materials, or technical assistance activities, did not materialize. Three important reasons contributed to this relative failure.

First, as a general principle, the projects' staffs and Boards almost without exception gave relatively little attention to the warnings by the Foundation that funds were finite and that alternative means of continued funding needed to be pursued during the life of the grant. Rather, as referenced above, there seemed to be a sense that if their work were successful, additional funds "would come from somewhere."

This pervasive attitude, coupled with the understandable desire to address the immediate day-to-day needs of service and program delivery, resulted in the most common scenario: funds for continuation after the Gannett grant were rarely considered until the end neared. Fees as a source of ongoing funding was no more vigorously contemplated than other avenues.

From a "marketing" perspective, yet another reason for the lack of fee-based revenue activity was that project staff had no real sense of how to go about putting a dollar value on their services and/or products. This in turn was coupled with a double-edged skepticism about whether anyone would want to pay for their service and whether anyone should. Obviously, few (if any) individuals go into the adult literacy field to make money; rather, there is a history and ethic of volunteerism which makes "selling" of one's program or services an unfamiliar, and by some perceptions, distasteful, process. These concerns and attitudes become particularly complex and troubling in dealing with the corporate sector, where the "bottom line" of cost to the employer becomes a point to be negotiated and hammered out from a business, rather than a human services, basis. Most literacy providers are not used to "hammering."

And finally, even those projects and staff who were able to develop strong materials with high potential for transferability and dissemination, were not versed on how to go about marketing the availability of their materials. The comprehensive documents developed by the Illinois project (referenced above) are a good example of this phenomenon. The Illinois project staff had presented information about their materials at regional, statewide, and national conferences in hopes of selling them. In addition, they made marketing of the documents a primary activity in their Gannett Foundation Bonus grant application (which was not funded). When neither of these two options worked out, they were stymied in developing other options. The pressures of day-to-day activities and concern for large-scale additional funding to replace the Gannett Foundation funds, overtook them, and they turned their attention away from fee-based revenue.

There was some hope that fees might be generated by the dissemination of information or technical assistance associated with the activities of those projects which addressed special populations. For example, one of the components of the Minnesota project (MALC), led by the state's Learning Disabilities Association (LDA), involved the development of resource materials for teachers and volunteers who work with adults affected by both illiteracy and learning disabilities. A series of teacher handbooks was developed, and staff made efforts to disseminate the materials nationally, with some success. Nevertheless, although inquiries came from more than 40 states, LDA staff reported that no significant income from the distribution of the materials had been generated.

Similarly, efforts of four collaborating organizations in Kentucky (the Kentucky Foundation for Literacy, Inc., the Governor's Literacy Commission, the State Department of Education, and Kentucky Educational Television) produced two series of videotapes and associated materials for tutor training and organizational development. These materials have been used as training resources both within and outside the state, although, again, staff reported that only very limited revenue (a few hundred dollars) was generated.

The Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy (WACAL) had some hope of marketing on a fee-for-service basis the materials and skills they had developed in the area of workforce literacy. WACAL focused considerable effort and attention on workforce issues during its two years of Gannett Foundation funding, including the convening of a statewide conference targeted to business involvement with literacy, the development of a workplace reading list, the conduct of a business and literacy survey, and the compiling of an annotated bibliography listing materials in the WACAL Business and Literacy Project resource library. At the conclusion of the Literacy Challenge, some of the business and literacy functions were continued by Washington Literacy (a Coalition member), and a fee structure was indeed established for organizations requesting more formal consulting services. Subsequent correspondence, however, indicated that there was no significant response to this approach.

At the time of the site visit, those interviewed indicated how disappointed they had been with their lack of progress in developing a referral system software marketing plan (based on their hotline system). Staff had hoped to identify a software manufacturing/marketing partner who would help them transfer the system to other potential users, primarily other states. They concluded that the initiative had proven too time-consuming to pursue and hence was not developed.

5. Cooperative/Collaborative Process

A key element of the Literacy Challenge grants program was the requirement that the projects be coalitions and cooperative efforts. This directive clearly encouraged potentially competing agencies to work together both in submitting the original proposals and in actually implementing the work. In fact, this aspect of the initiative seemed to work exceedingly well. Even in those states which did not receive a grant during the first year of competition, respondents frequently indicated that the requirement to submit a single, cooperative bid allowed—indeed forced—them to work together in ways which, in many cases, had never been done before. It is also important to recognize the importance of the size of the grants. In many of these states, in the field of adult literacy services, the potential availability of $100,000 over a one-year period (and in some instances, continuation funds) was the equivalent of a small fortune (albeit one which quickly shrank when applied to the many needs and aspirations of state-level activities). The money was a powerful tool in bringing together disparate groups.

At times, however, the strategy also set the stage for potential, subsequent problems which emerged for some states even after they had successfully won their grant. In many cases, there was little preparation for real coalition functioning; that is, the organizations and individuals had little experience with creating and sustaining a coalition. This issue—how to forge coalition efforts which are sustainable over time—raised several provocative issues around "turf," "mission," and competition for scarce resources.

Strategies from the projects themselves for minimizing the difficulties associated with collaborations included (1) input through inter-agency, inter-organizational planning; (2) needs assessments to determine the best approaches for sharing resources; and (3) increased feedback to revised materials and training, with the expectation that training must be practical and direct.

An example of one of the more complicated efforts to develop a cooperative, collaborative initiative was the Connecticut project, LINC. In this case, a Governor-appointed 28-member Coalition for Literacy (diverse in nature itself) associated with the State Education Department of Education, formed an alliance with the Bridgeport Mayor's Commission on Adult Literacy (another diverse group), the Bridgeport Board of Education, and Interdenominational Ministerial Alliance (IMA), a coalition of 26 Black ministers and their respective churches. In other words, a complicated coalition existed at the state level, which interfaced with a complicated collaboration at the city level, which in turn interfaced with a complicated, loose network at the local level.

In fact, the statewide and citywide coalitions played virtually no role in the actual conduct of the project; the role of the IMA, however, was critical. More than most of the other projects, the outcome of this project depended highly on the strategic interaction of its individual pieces to make a successful whole. The project was designed to function as a self-contained system. Key components included (1) the ministers, and the degree to which they were willing to endorse and promote the program; (2) the liaisons, as the individuals who had to carry out the momentum begun by the ministers and facilitate the actual process of accessing the literacy systems; (3) the LINC Coordinator who was the literacy systems' "face" to the black ministers, liaisons, and congregations; (4) the Literacy Specialist, who assessed the students and assigned them to an appropriate tutor; and (5) the Literacy Volunteer who provided the tutor training. Each of these played a vital role in the network, and the absence or significant diminution of any of these roles could change, and even potentially destroy, the network.

This project produced mixed results. There was a general sense that the project did indeed reach individuals who, without the encouragement of the ministers and the church liaisons, would not otherwise have reached out for services. The number of such individuals was not so great as initially hoped at the start of the project, but nevertheless were sufficient to indicate that the approach had merit. At least some black students and tutors were added to the system.

Most disappointing was the fact that the IMA did not take over the functions of Project LINC at the conclusion of the Gannett Foundation initiative. In retrospect, staff realized that the IMA was not an entity per se, but rather a loose network of organizations (which happened to be churches). Moreover, although the President of the IMA indicated strong personal and institutional support for the activities and intentions of the effort, he did not believe that financial support could be garnered from the resources of the IMA itself ("churches are full of poor people"). Absent the absorption of project activities by the IMA, and in the face of massive statewide and citywide budget deficits, the initiative disappeared after the cessation of Gannett Foundation funds.

C. Operating Environments

1. Politics and Institutionalization

Among the most important variables influencing the outcomes of the projects was the political environment within which they operated. The location of the project along the continuum of public/private sponsorship was of particular significance. (See Table 3.) Eleven of the projects were housed within some branch of state government, with an additional two located in state universities. The most frequent government location was within the Departments of Education (e.g., California, Connecticut, and Mississippi), followed by Library Services (e.g, Alabama and Nevada). Because of the statewide coordination requirement of the Literacy Challenge grants program, most of the projects located in state agencies found themselves involved to varying extents with their Office of the Governor; some were the focal points of Governors' wives interests. A smaller group (eight) were awarded to already existing 501(c)(3) nonprofit organizations (for example, Alaska, New Mexico, and Minnesota); as a caveat, however, some of the nonprofits actually worked so intimately with state government as to be almost indistinguishable, as, for example, the New York State Literacy Council. Each of these "locations" had pluses and minuses for the Challenge grantees.

a. Location Within a State Agency. The greatest benefit associated with being located within a state agency was the relatively high probability that at least some, even if not all, of the activities generated by the available Gannett Foundation funds would be picked up and continued after the end of the project. In the optimal instances, not only were activities picked up by the agency, but staff were as well. This was particularly true if the project staff had been associated with the agency before the award of Foundation funds. Such was the case of the Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition (IALC), a project located in the Education Department. In its early phase (1983-1986), the IALC was a Governor's task force. Then, in October 1986, the Coalition became an official state entity under a statute of the Indiana General Assembly. It is actually an administrative partnership among the Indiana Department of Education, the Governor's Voluntary Action Program, and the Indiana State Library. Its organizational mission is to provide state leadership which encourages and supports local efforts to eliminate illiteracy among adults.

Although the level of activity associated with adult literacy was somewhat reduced after the grant, core functions, and the individual who was providing them, remained within the state agency. No continuity, and only a little momentum, had been lost at the time of the site visit (conducted after the conclusion of the project).

The Nevada Literacy Coalition (NLC), which was developed in response to the availability of the Gannett Foundation funds, was located at the Nevada State Library and Archives. It quickly gained the Governor's attention (the Governor's wife presiding at its Open House in July 1987) and then developed executive and legislative initiatives. Although the executive initiative was slowed by the Governor's campaign for U.S. Senate (which was successful), the new Governor indicated agreement with it. The opportunity to develop and submit a proposal for a Literacy Challenge grant was a significant impetus for a coordinated effort among government and volunteer organizations. By their own accounting, preparation of the proposal resulted, for the first time, in the coming together of representatives from a broad cross section of those concerned with literacy to discuss a statewide literacy agency and to identify and prioritize immediate and long-term goals. The Nevada Literacy Coalition was the only project funded by the Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge for more than two years.

The Nevada project was successful in lobbying the Nevada Legislature for funds to be earmarked within the Library system. Upon receipt of such funds, and the implied mandate, the Library agency absorbed the project staff and activities. Adult literacy is now a "permanent" staff line within the agency. As a coalition with public and private partners, the NLC was able to gain and maintain the interest and support of the Governor. In this example, the "project" was "institutionalized" into the ongoing tasks and responsibilities of the state agency.

The Nevada Coalition staff regarded the development of a Foundation for Literacy in Nevada in 1990 as one of their major accomplishments. As described in their Year 2 proposal, the motivating intent was to "develop an entity (distinctly reflecting a private sector arm of the Coalition) and mechanism for receiving, monitoring, and expending of funds received from private sector individuals and organizations." To create the Foundation, the Coalition had to explore its feasibility with the Nevada Bar Association, the State Attorney General's Office, the Governor's Office, and other involved public and private organizations. Among others, the Coalition hoped that the Foundation could capture United Way funds. With an optimism shared by several other state coalitions, staff wrote in their Year 2 proposal: "It is expected that there will be a groundswell of financial support for literacy activities on the local level once the Literacy Project is in full operation."

Although the greatest advantage to being located within a state agency is the potential for long-term stability of both staff lines and adult literacy activities, potential disadvantages exist as well.

The most negative feature of being located within a state agency is the relative lack of control over the environment. Adult literacy issues must compete for attention even within the agency and hence are quite vulnerable to the attitudes and decisions of the existing commissioner or superintendent toward adult literacy. In some instances, turnover in key leadership positions during the conduct of the Gannett Foundation grant resulted in diminution of project visibility and aspirations, as senior-level agency staff turned their attention to other issues of higher priority to the new leadership. State agency staff must be attentive to the "mission" of their agency, and that mission has been defined and is located within the context of other bureaucratic entities. Hence, there are institutional barriers to what staff may or may not do to further their project interests and activities.

For example, those projects located within state agencies had little recourse when funds became scarce or priorities changed beyond their own agency at the state level. In times of fiscal uncertainty, commitments and understandings can change; projects can become burdensome and secondary to other priorities. Today's "darling" can quickly become tomorrow's superfluous expense. When this happens to a program within a state agency, it is unlikely that staff will be encouraged, or perhaps even allowed, to use their time searching for funds from other sources. It is more likely that they will be assigned to other duties more in line with higher priorities and/or available state funds.

The fate of the Alabama Literacy Coalition demonstrated the fragility of government funding. Facing severe fiscal deficits, the state scaled back its commitment to continuation of the Coalition. Unable to raise funds from other sources, the ALC atrophied despite the continued interest of the Director of Alabama Public Library Service.

The process of project faltering was documented in the ALC's newsletters. In January 1989, "Desey (Director of the Alabama Public Library Service) to list Coalition in 1989 APLS Budget Request. If the legislature approves this item, the Coalition will become a permanent state-supported program"; in February, the Coalition petitions its supporters to write to the state legislature to indicate Coalition support; in May, "Literacy legislation is introduced" and the Coalition reports the rejection of its Gannett Foundation Bonus grant proposal; and in June, the Coalition finally reports, "The future of the Coalition is in jeopardy. The budget for the APLS has been cut drastically. The Agency cannot assume the fiscal responsibility for continuing the Coalition."

Also raised by some of the government sponsored projects' staff were partisan issues. In some states (for example, New Mexico and Alabama) the leadership in the Governor's Office was not the same political party as that of the legislative majority. In such cases, strong politically-based endorsement from one "side" can introduce real problems based on large-scale in-fighting for political power and influence.

This potential for in-fighting is not limited solely to the public sector; it can also extend to the public-private arena. In one interesting example, the New Mexico Governor, highly visible in his support of the Gannett Foundation grantee, announced his intention to implement a very unpopular business tax the week before a joint fundraising event was to occur on behalf of the adult literacy coalition. Although the New Mexico Coalition is a nonprofit organization outside government influence, this political decision and action directly affected the Coalition. Coalition staff had to scramble to hold business-based commitments.

Literacy in Nevada was a popular issue which made for strong political interest during the life of the Gannett Foundation grant. Over the course of the grant, Governor Bryan was elected to the Senate, making (along with Harry Reid) two Senators committed to literacy in the state; and the new Governor, Robert Miller, maintained the support for literacy. The experience of the Nevada Coalition presented an interesting story in the pluses and minuses associated with this political desirability.

The Coalition's successful efforts to "institutionalize" itself within state government had set the stage for an unforeseen event. At the time of the site visit, the project was undergoing considerable stress associated with the recent loss of the original project director, and the subsequent three months of vacancy in the director's position. The original project director had worked closely with the head of the State Library and Archives to obtain legislative approval and funding to permanently house the Literacy Coalition within state government (sought primarily as a means to stabilize funding). An unintended consequence occurred, however. One of the first things that the Governor did when the two staff positions became state-supported was to replace the original project director with a political appointment. This unexpected turn of events left everyone associated with the Coalition somewhat stunned since the original project director has been well liked and was thoroughly grounded in literacy issues. The new project director did not have an adult literacy background and was engaged in visiting literacy programs to learn about their histories and priorities. In sum, having succeeded in joining state government, the project became subject to state decision making.

Reflecting the Coalition's new status, a new 25-member Governor's Literacy Coalition Advisory Council was formed in December 1989. According to staff, the Council played no role in the selection of the new Coalition Coordinator. This "model" of state institutionalization was an interesting contrast to that of the New Mexico Coalition for Literacy (NMCL), which had determined that too close an association with state government was not advisable. Looking to a broad base of funding, the NMCL perceived that close association with any political entity might endanger the neutrality and objectivity which the Coalition needed to survive (as demonstrated by the story above).

Having been sponsored by the Mississippi State Department of Education, the Mississippi Literacy Coalition was funded by the Gannett Foundation for one year. At the end of that time, Coalition activities waned. Two other entities had emerged during the life of the Coalition which overtook and surpassed it in literacy activities: The Governor's Office of Literacy and the Mississippi Literacy Foundation.

Sparked in part by the original (Year 1) Gannett Foundation application process, and by ongoing Literacy Coalition activities, adult literacy enjoyed considerable attention in Mississippi from the Governor and his wife. This interest, based on concerns about the link between adult literacy and economic well-being (and a recommendation from the Literacy Coalition), culminated in the creation of the Governor's Office for Literacy in September 1988, established to serve as the Governor's coordinating office for all public and private activities dealing with the problem of adult functional illiteracy. Dr. Karl Haigler, a nationally known literacy expert, was recruited to direct the Office's activities. The Office was not particularly involved in the Literacy Challenge grant activities. Rather, described as a coordinating umbrella over all of the state's literacy efforts, the Office saw as its mandates the setting of policy and the establishment of standards of accountability and effectiveness. It was also to provide assistance in program management to the Mississippi Literacy Foundation. VISTA Volunteers (35 requested; 25 assigned) worked under the supervision of the Office.

In addition, in September 1988, the Governor's wife, Julie Mabus, began the process of establishing the Mississippi Literacy Foundation, a nonprofit 501(c)(3), for the purpose of raising monies from private sources. The establishment of the Foundation eventually attracted statewide and national attention from corporations and foundations. (Early donations came from Proctor and Gamble, as well as from private individuals; a $250,000 tractor-trailer rig for conversion into a mobile basic skills technology laboratory was donated to the Foundation by Frito-Lay.) From the start, the Foundation worked with the Governor's Office for Literacy and the Literacy Coalition to identify short-range and long-range needs of the state, promoting collaborations, innovations, and public/private partnerships.

When the time came to submit a Bonus Grant proposal to the Gannett Foundation, a decision was made that the applicant would be the Mississippi Literacy Foundation rather than the Literacy Coalition (or the State Department of Education. The decision reflected the shifting roles and responsibilities of the three entities. Since the priorities of the Foundation were not necessarily those of the original Literacy Coalition (which focussed on the development and dissemination of tutor intervention models), a new set of initiatives was proposed as Bonus activities. The Bonus application was not funded.

In this particular instance, the availability of the Gannett Foundation funds came at a time of high political receptivity to the issues of adult literacy, especially those associated with the link between individual literacy and macro-level (state) economic well-being. Mississippi was clearly poised on the brink of investing in literacy initiatives, as demonstrated by the creation of the Governor's Office for Literacy, the recruitment and hiring of Dr. Haigler, and the incorporation of the Mississippi Literacy Foundation. What the Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge grant did was to initially mobilize individuals and organizations to work together toward statewide solutions. In a sense, the momentum then overtook and surpassed the activities associated with the initial effort.

To summarize, one of the greatest potential values in being located within a state agency is the possibility of long-term stability. The stability is fragile, however, and subject to changes in leadership, priorities, and funds.

In spite of disadvantages such as some of those described above, grantees recognized the inherent value of an initiative which enjoys the complete endorsement and support of a powerful political entity. Particularly for those housed within state agencies, and therefore accustomed to bureaucratic environments, the most coveted support was that directly associated with the Governor, a Governor's surrogate such as the Governor's wife, a Governor's Office, a high-level, Governor-convened Advisory or Task Force group, or influential legislative leaders. Knowing of such arrangements in some of the Literacy Challenge states, staff from one project poignantly commented that their Governor had no wife whom they could petition.

In a variation on public sector sponsorship (in this case, the state's Department of Education), one project made extensive use of a consulting firm to conduct project activities. The California Alliance for Literacy (CAL) is an ad hoc volunteer group led by the State Director of Education and the State Librarian. As such, it is mainly an inter-governmental agency association without paid staff. The consulting firm, SRA Associates, was contracted by CAL to (1) develop and produce two Information and Referral Directories; (2) conduct workshops providing technical assistance to community-based organizations; and (3) handle all logistics including promotion and reservations.

No other state relied so heavily on consultants to perform project activities. The implications of using an "outside" resource such as SRA should be considered. In this case, the work done was generally regarded as excellent; unfortunately, subsequent "institutionalization" of the products into internal operations at the conclusion of the consultant contract was not so successful. For example, at the time of the site visit the computer disks associated with the Information and Referral Directory were still at SRA Associates rather than the Department of Education.

In California, the emphasis did not appear to be so focused on statewide coalition efforts as in some other states, in part because of difficulties in coordinating multiple, very large municipalities and wide geographic distances. According to respondents during the site visit, the greatest impact the Gannett Foundation grant had in California was to encourage the Department of Education to expand its efforts to work with community-based organizations. This was particularly important since such organizations can be especially effective in reaching targeted native-born populations.

Three projects (Illinois, Delaware and Maine) began with public agency sponsorship and then developed nonprofit entities. The Illinois Literacy Resource Development Project (ILRDP) was a collective effort of Illinois' six major public and nonprofit literacy organizations. The project was overseen by a Board consisting of representatives from each of these six organizations. Funded for two years, Gannett Foundation funds were administered by the State Board of Education.

Originally convened in response to the availability of the Gannett Foundation funds, subsequent to the two years of the conduct of the ILRDP, the Coalition moved in the direction of creating a 501(c)(3). This was the outcome of a difficult and irritating situation. As the end of the Gannett Foundation funding neared, the need to solicit funds had raised issues about the identity of the Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center. What was it? Was it a state entity, a "project," a nonprofit without a 501(c)(3), a 501(c)(3)? The staff and Board knew they needed to obtain more stable funding, but the issue in Illinois of whether the private nonprofits should be allowed to contract directly for state funds was controversial.

The issue (which was of concern in some other states as well) was particularly important to this project as its Board membership included both public and nonprofit, private agencies. The debate had been going on for several years. Obviously, those who were currently receiving public funds were not enthusiastic about the potential competition. Their view was that the public sector system itself was in shambles and needed shoring up, not competition. The Chicago public schools and the community colleges were the largest public providers; the nonprofit, private agencies generally were community-based organizations.

Changes were taking place, but slowly. In response to the state's restriction on direct funding to nonprofits, substantial dollars were being moved through the Secretary of State's office to make funds for literacy volunteer training available to both public and nonprofit, private agencies. The strategy had worked, but it had also reduced the pressures to change the system. This was a peripheral issue to some extent (although vexing in some other states as well) since ways had been found to circumvent the restriction, but it directly affected the project because of its own "in the middle" situation, and because of the continuing debate about whether or not to create a 501(c)(3).

Alabama was another example where there was conflict between the public and private sectors. The hotline (not funded with Gannett Foundation monies) was funded jointly by the State's Adult Basic Education and Continuing Education. Callers were referred only to state-funded programs, not to private literacy providers. No statistics were collected on the nature of the calls. The Coalition, sponsored by the state's Alabama Public Library Service, had no access to the names of those who inquired about literacy services or the results of the calls, an interesting commentary on the lack of communication and cooperation even among the state agencies.

The Delaware project, DCL, reflected yet another relationship between government and nonprofit, private sectors. The DCL was formed in 1985 as a statewide partnership of many organizations concerned with adult literacy, including the State Department of Public Instruction. During the Gannett Foundation project year, the Coalition received its 501(c)(3) status. In this form, it expected to receive support in the future from both private and public sources. As the State Supervisor of Adult/Community Education, Delaware State Department of Public Instruction (also serving as the Chair of the Delaware Coalition for Literacy), concluded, "The nonprofit aspect of (the Coalition) has the agencies talking to one another. Being able to come before the Governor's Economic Development Cabinet has tremendously increased our political impact so that literacy is the highest priority within the overall human services initiative."

The Maine Literacy Coalition (MLC) was able to function in the "middle" ground between independence and government support. The relationship between state and local government in Maine is unique in that the local government is town government which has many programmatic responsibilities. Almost half of the population of the state lives in towns with fewer than 2,000 people. As a result, operating a coalition in Maine means bringing together towns on a regional basis as well as employers and providers. Interestingly, the MLC itself was structured like a New England town meeting: anyone attending meetings had the authority to vote.

The Coalition was convened in response to the availability of the Gannett Foundation funds. In fact, the organizing of the Coalition was itself a major goal of the first year activities. Although initially sponsored within the State Department of Educational and Cultural Services, during the course of the two years of Gannett Foundation funding the Coalition applied for and received status as a 501(c)(3) organization. Nevertheless, the effort continued to receive support from State government as well as industry, provider agencies, and other sources. The Coalition Coordinator is employed by the State Education Department and is the liaison to the Coalition. This position allowed her to be an effective "inside" advocate for the Coalition while building a strong, citizen-based constituency.

Also of interesting note is the fact that one of Maine's particular strengths is the substantial amount of support that the Guy Gannett Publishing Company* has given to adult literacy. This support has included the dedication of a senior staff person to promote adult literacy, specifically within the corporate sector.

As in other cases where Coalitions are nonprofit organizations, the MLC Board and staff were aware that developing ongoing sources of revenue is a key requirement for future continued stability. The Gannett Foundation grant was considered pivotal in both establishing the Coalition and helping to institutionalize it. In particular, the Project Coordinator felt that the grant, and the sign-off process that the foundation required (including even the decision to accept stock as a form of payment), greatly increased the visibility and prestige of the grant and the Coalition within all levels of government including the offices of the Governor, the Comptroller, and the Budget.

---

*The Guy Gannett Publishing Company has no relationship to the Gannett Foundation.

b. Located Within a Nonprofit Organization. As sponsoring entities, nonprofit, private organizations present a different set of "pluses and minuses" than those of the public sector. A significant value to functioning as a nonprofit organization is the relative freedom to pursue a wide variety of potential activities and funding streams. A different kind of stability can be achieved if an organization is successful in diversifying its activities and its funding base. Diversified activities in adult literacy can range from materials development, marketing, and distribution, as in the Indiana project; direct student training and train-the-trainer training, as in virtually all of the projects; to targeted services to special populations, as in the New Mexico and Connecticut projects.

Having the flexibility to do a variety of tasks and services provides the opportunity to pursue a wider base of funding sources. This base can include government funds (at national, state, regional, county and city levels), foundations, corporations, and private individuals. In addition, funds can be generated from fees for service and from profits associated with the marketing of products. Unfortunately, as noted earlier, the adult literacy field, like virtually all other human service fields, has not been "entrepreneurial" in nature. Hence, too frequently the opportunity of nonprofits to be "free" from bureaucratic encumbrances has meant "free to be poor."

In some cases, the nonprofit grantee was one of several established organizations coming together to form a coalition, as in the case of Minnesota, Alaska, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky. The Minnesota Coalition was composed completely of nonprofit organizations, while the Alaska, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky coalitions included public sector partners (modestly involved in Alaska; more extensively involved in Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Kentucky). In other instances, as in Washington and New Mexico, the grantee was a single organization with a Board of Directors that included representatives from relevant other organizations (hence, providing a "coalition" framework).

In an example of a project structure reflecting a nonprofit organization serving as the lead agency for a group of other agencies, the Alaska Literacy Challenge Coalition proposal was submitted by Nine Star Enterprises. The Coalition itself was composed of nine nonprofit organizations (later reduced to six), with the State Adult Education Director serving in an ex officio capacity. In that all of the other Coalition members were local organizations, Nine Star was the only Coalition member that fit the Gannett Foundation requirement for statewide coverage.

Nine Star Enterprises itself grew out of an initiative of the public sector. In 1976, the Alaska Education Commissioner created a "super staff development agency" which evolved in 1978 into the The Northern Institute (TNI). The TNI rose to a peak level of activity in 1982 but then collapsed with the oil crisis and crash of 1986-87. The President and Board of Directors agreed to close the Institute, but some of the staff wanted to continue. Inheriting the remaining activities and work products of the TNI, Nine Star Enterprises was created as a 501(c)(3) corporation. Nine Star functions as a nonprofit agency, pursuing "soft" contract dollars, primarily from the Alaska Department of Education and JTPA funds.

Minnesota presented an unusual profile of the relationship between the public and private sectors. In their case, a Governor's initiative (the Governor's Advisory Committee) in 1985 resulted in the development of a long-range plan which included the creation of a nonprofit independent organization, the Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign (MALC) in 1986. In spite of this initial relationship, funding for MALC came primarily from two local foundations, with occasional additional outside support such as that from the Gannett Foundation. MALC never received any public sector funds.

Yet another unique feature of the MALC was its "sunset" provision. At the time of its creation, funding and support commitments were established but time-limited to five years. Hence, MALC always presented itself as an entity with a five-year life span. Nevertheless, due in part to the achievements and successes of the organization, in 1989 the Board began to debate whether to try to find sufficient alternative funding to keep functioning beyond June 1991. The final decision was to close the organization on time, and subsequent staff and board activities focused on finding other entities willing to take on the functions which had been provided by MALC.

This decision to close was driven by the conclusion that it would be impossible to generate sufficient funds to be able to maintain a quality program. The inability of MALC to capture public funds to continue its efforts was influenced by two circumstances: (1) staff and board ambivalences about compromises which might have to be made in deference to government funding; and (2) the fact that adult illiteracy was still not perceived as an area of great need within the state. Described as "the brain power state," Minnesota has a low school-dropout rate coupled with a low unemployment rate. Hence, staff stated, businesses do not perceive that they have a problem recruiting and maintaining an adequately skilled workforce. Finally, there was a sense on the part of staff that in this state (as in some other states) the direct funding of nonprofit organizations by government is not popular, and that this attitude had hampered their ability to seek public sector funds.

Formation of the Kentucky Foundation for Literacy, Inc., a nonprofit private corporation, presented another interesting example of the interaction of public and private sectors. The Foundation was created as a "companion organization" to the pre-existing (created in 1985) Governor's Commission on Literacy. It was expected to aid the Commission in the identification and development of financial resources to supplement the state's modest General Fund public resources. As a nonprofit corporation, the Foundation provided businesses, individuals, and educational foundations the opportunity to make tax-free contributions to the literacy effort. These tax-free contributions helped establish several demonstration projects and other services.

The coalition formed to respond to the Literacy Challenge Grants opportunity included the Governor's Commission on Literacy, the Kentucky Department of Education, Kentucky Educational Television (KET), and the Foundation as the fiscal agent.

The Massachusetts Coalition for Adult Literacy (MCAL) is a statewide coalition that incorporated as a not-for-profit 501(c)(3) organization after the first-year Literacy Challenge Grant. The Coalition placed a heavy emphasis on the promotion of programs, fundraising, and legislation. In this sense, MCAL was an "outside" advocate; it used demonstrations, petition drives, voter registration, and press events to draw attention to adult literacy. Although located outside state government initiatives, the Coalition coordinated planning and activities with all state agencies involved in literacy through a workforce strategy. At the same time, it was intended to be an independent, advocacy-oriented voice outside the framework of state government.

The MCAL Board and staff knew from its origination that funds would have be raised for its continuation. Nevertheless, while playing what, in retrospect, appears to have been a significant role in several public policy issues, including the legislative passage of important workplace initiatives, the Coalition was not able to generate sufficient funds at the conclusion of the Gannett Foundation grant period to maintain paid staff and most Coalition activities.

Similar to events in Mississippi, MCAL was overshadowed by the emergence of the Governor's Literacy Initiative, which, during the first year of the MCAL, broadened its scope by changing from the Commonwealth Literary Corps to the Commonwealth Literacy Campaign (CLC). The CLC, headed by a former State Senator, performed activities such as developing public service announcements and coordinating interagency government initiatives. MCAL's activities supported those of the CLC in the areas of public awareness and business/labor. The Commonwealth Literacy Campaign was itself eventually absorbed by the Department of Education.

The Tennessee coalition proposal was submitted on behalf of 12 public and private agencies and groups. The project began under the auspices of a nonprofit organization, the Tennessee Community Education Association (TCEA), whose primary purpose was to forward community education as an operational method in delivering multiple services and programs in local communities.

During the first year of the grant, the Coalition Oversight Committee decided that the Tennessee Literacy Coalition, Inc. (TLC) should assume fiscal oversight for the Gannett Foundation funds. The TLC was formed in 1982 to improve communication among literacy providers, raise the level of visibility of literacy needs and programs in the state, and offer a forum for some coordination of efforts. Activities of the TLC had been energized by several recent events including new leadership and better working relationships with various state government departments.

As a side comment on the "fragility" of the political environment in which the Gannett Foundation projects operated, in its initial proposal the Tennessee Literacy Coalition suggested that there was strong evidence that Tennessee's Governor-elect intended to make adult literacy a high priority issue. They stated: "As the new administration determines its involvement with adult literacy, the state coalition will be in a position to provide excellent leadership, counsel and/or resources. The state coalition/oversight committee would serve as a task force within a larger Governor's Adult Literacy Commission, assuming such a commission is formed, as has been recommended." Three years later, at the time of the site visit, staff indicated that their expectation that the Governor would make adult literacy a high priority had not been realized. Further, there was no First Lady to pursue, as was the case in some other states. The Governor's Adult Literacy Commission, although recommended, never did form.

The New Mexico Coalition for Literacy (NMCL) was an example of a very successful nonprofit corporation emerging from the public sector. Incorporated in December 1987 under the auspices of Katherine Carruthers, the wife of New Mexico Governor Garrey Carruthers, and also supported by United States Senator Jeff Bingaman, the Coalition enjoyed considerable, bipartisan support. Nevertheless, even with this political support, the Coalition faced significant challenges in its efforts to remain active.

Initially housed in the Office of the First Lady, the Coalition successfully petitioned for state appropriations. The Coalition Board is primarily composed of private sector members who are very active and involved with the organization and its activities, including raising funds from various sources. Moreover, to improve linkages and coordination, the Coalition applied for and became the official state organization for Laubach Literacy Action and for Literacy Volunteers of America, Inc. In this capacity, it serves as an intermediary service provider for those affiliates and councils in New Mexico.

During its first year of work the NMCL received $60,000 from the Governor's Office to pay for administrative costs. It was expected that an annual application would continue to be submitted to the Governor, and his successors in office, for a state allocation of funds. In addition, the NMCL was to actively seek funds from businesses, foundations, individuals, and non-business organizations, as well as from fundraising dinners and promotional items.

At the time of the site visit the NMCL Executive Director and Board of Directors were concerned about obtaining approximately $200,000, which had become "bogged down" in the state system (the funds were later received). Although the monies were targeted to the Coalition, the allocation had to be processed through the Department of Education, which was moving slowly. This situation illustrated the complexity of the "insider-outsider" position of the Coalition.

Creation of the Coalition as a 501(c)(3) was regarded by some as further evidence that the Governor was trying to "privatize" the delivery of social and human services in the state. This set the stage for bureaucratic, institutional resistance in that there was some sentiment that the allocated monies had been "taken away" from the budget of the Department of Education. The situation was further complicated by the fact that the Legislature, which had allocated the funds important to the Coalition, had recessed. Even without issues of institutional resistance, the Coalition was concerned about whether their sole source contract would be snagged in the Attorney General's Office. As reflected in the correspondence and materials sent subsequent to the site visit, all of these problems were eventually resolved, and the monies have continued to be allocated to the Coalition.

It should be noted, however, that the effort required to generate the legislative appropriations was significant. Not only did it require the organizing of hundreds of literacy workers, arranging for students to testify, and hours of the Executive Director's and Board members' time, but also it is an unending process. Additionally, even when funds pass all of the hurdles referenced above, they can only be drawn down on a reimbursement basis; hence, cash flow problems will be ongoing.

The Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy (WACAL) was sponsored by Washington Literacy (WL), a statewide nonprofit organization which provides community education, training and technical assistance, information and referral, and resources and materials; WL also advocates for illiterate adults, develops innovative literacy programs, and is the state's primary source of public information on volunteer literacy services. WL also worked with VISTA Volunteers whose placements supported volunteer literacy work at the community level.

WACAL itself is a statewide coalition which formed in 1984 as the communication link among key organizations involved in adult literacy activities. It also pursues funds for literacy programs, conducts public awareness efforts, and assists in the formation and development of local community coalitions. At the time of its Year 1 proposal, WACAL included representatives from the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Washington State Library, the State Board for Community College Education, Washington Literacy, the Department of Social and Health Services, Employment Security, Region X Office of the U.S. Department of Education, Adult Basic Education Directors, and the Western Washington PLUS Task Force. This was a recently expanded membership, reflecting the WACAL desire for formal recognition and participation by the Governor in appointing an expanded roster of members.

The submitted proposal built on existing coalition work in the state (which had occurred over the preceding three years). WACAL was the only existing statewide adult literacy coordination entity which encompassed more than one type of agency or program. The literacy system was active at the time, with private, nonprofit, local government, state government, and federal government agencies sponsoring, funding, and/or operating a wide range of programs for diverse populations. The proposal writers identified priorities reflecting short-term, long-term, and continuing needs. The priorities fell into five categories, which in turn related directly to the goals of the proposed Literacy Challenge project.

During the second year of Gannett Foundation funding, the Coalition experienced two changes in leadership and a change in the management of the project. As part of the process of reassessing its long-range goals and priorities, the Coalition decided to incorporate as a nonprofit corporation. The most advantageous tax status options were being reviewed at the end of Year 2, to be decided pending the outcome of proposed legislation that would affect funding for current project activities.

WACAL sent funding support requests for two priority areas (the volunteer tutor training and the hotline) to a variety of potential supporters, including the original funders, member agencies and member contacts, local corporations, and government agencies. In seeking project funding through the appeal letters, WACAL decided to prioritize hotline continuation since the loss of this service would have the greatest impact on literacy service provision. In light of the limited funding available, WACAL members planned to share at least some of the duties previously performed by staff.

Although listed in Table 3 as having nonprofit sponsorship, both Oregon and Pennsylvania were housed within their state university system. In the first instance, there was a significant amount of state interaction; this was less so in the case of Pennsylvania.

Oregon's Literacy Connection was established as an ad hoc organization. (It was the only coalition-type project which did not include the word "coalition" in its title.) Like the Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign, it was ambivalent about its intention to continue beyond a fixed period. The OLC was a statewide consortium of agencies and organizations formed with Gannett Foundation funding to coordinate literacy activities and to improve and expand volunteer literacy services throughout Oregon. Primarily led by Oregon State University (the Oregon State University Foundation served as fiscal agent at no direct cost to the project), it brought together three other entities—the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Oregon Literacy, Inc., and the Oregon Department of Education's Community College Division. Except for the Project Coordinator, who was hired after the project began, staff were drawn from these groups.

The Pennsylvania State Coalition for Adult Literacy (PSCAL), was housed at the Institute for the Study of Adult Education in the Department of Education, Pennsylvania State University; the Coalition's Project Director also was the Director of the Institute and was a professor at the University. Coalition activities were among many interrelated initiatives undertaken by the Institute. The Coalition was established in response to the availability of the Literacy Challenge opportunity. The Institute served as the fiscal agent of the grant monies, and the Governing Board determined and approved how monies were spent.

Government was well represented on the Governing Board, including active participation from high level, state agency staff. Both Governor Robert Casey and his wife, Ellen, supported statewide literacy efforts, and demonstrated their commitment by selecting the PSCAL as the recipient of their annual fundraising event, "Pennsylvania, Yes!" in 1988 and again in 1989 (each producing several thousand dollars for the Coalition's activities). Ellen Casey was further featured as a guest speaker at several public events, as well as in the 20-,30-, and 60-second PSAs developed with the message to contact the Coalition for assistance with literacy problems.

Through the convening of a blue-ribbon advisory committee from the Governing Board, efforts were made to consider how to "institutionalize" the Coalition early in its formation. Consideration was given to several models ranging from support from the Governor's Office as an agency within state government, to an entirely independent entity supported by fees, memberships, and private sector contributions. Eventually, a Strategic Planning Task Force emerged from these discussions, charged with the directive to write a strategic plan for the future of the Coalition. The general direction selected for the Coalition's future was to continue functioning as a publicly and privately supported entity with the goals of advocacy, public awareness, training, and improvement of practice. The plan emphasized effective workplace literacy programs.

As an interesting aside, PSCAL was able to "leverage" its Gannett Foundation funds for a larger sum. Using $10,000 from the grant (with Gannett Foundation permission) as part of a $40,000 "match," PSCAL received a $120,000 grant from the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce to develop videotape and print materials for providers on how to design basic skills instruction for a workplace or job training setting. These materials were then to be made available to local coalitions.

Although listed in Table 3 as having nonprofit, private sponsorship, the New York State project exemplified yet another "hybrid" relationship with state government. The applicant agency, the State Literacy Council, is a nonprofit 501(c)(3) corporation, but it actually functioned as an adjunct to the State Education Department. The Council itself serves as a subcommittee to the Adult Learning Services Council, an advisory body to the State Education Commissioner. The Project Director was assigned from the SED Division of Adult and Continuing Education Program's Bureau of Adult and Continuing Education Program Development.

In addition, the Bureau of Adult and Continuing Education Program Development had received a 1987-88 VISTA Literacy Corps grant designed to stimulate and maintain 11 regional PLUS Task Forces. Sixteen VISTA Volunteers were assigned throughout the state. The VISTA Literacy Corps Project Director was also housed at the State Education Department and interacted regularly with the Gannett Foundation Project Director "to utilize fiscal and human resources for their mutual objectives."

2. Overall State Environments

In addition to the important role which public or private sponsorship played in the conduct and outcomes of the projects, the overall state "environment" (its receptivity to adult literacy issues) within which the projects evolved, ranging from embryonic to well-developed, was also important. For example, the states varied considerably in their level of concern about the link between economic well-being and individual literacy. Those states with high unemployment rates, high illiteracy rates, and distressed economies (such as Mississippi, Indiana, Puerto Rico, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Connecticut) were primed for addressing adult literacy needs. Nevertheless, the outcomes of their concerns varied significantly. For example, in Mississippi, literacy efforts were raised to the level of the Governor's Office; the Indiana Coalition is a legislatively created partnership incorporating three major state entities; and adult literacy remains a high priority of government officials in Puerto Rico. Conversely, project activities atrophied after the closing of the Gannett Foundation funds in Rhode Island and Connecticut.

Three of the states, Delaware, Nevada and Minnesota, indicated that their unemployment rates were exceedingly low. In the first two instances, this spurred interest in adult literacy, while in the third it hampered interest. With an unemployment rate of 2.8 percent at the time of its proposal submission, the State Supervisor of Adult/Community Education, Delaware State Department of Public Instruction, stated, "We don't fire anyone anymore. When the unemployment rate is this low, it is clear that most individuals who are unemployed are in the hardest-to-reach population and the least educated. Therefore, they need more educational services." In Nevada's case, adult literacy received significant attention from employers as an incentive to maintain their existing workers. In contrast, relatively little workforce interest could be generated in Minnesota, as businesses perceived that an adequate, competent employee pool was available in the state.

In some states (for example, Washington, New York, Kentucky, New Mexico, Delaware, Alaska, California, Indiana, Illinois, and Minnesota), adult literacy issues were already well recognized and coalition-associated activities were well under way. In other cases (such as Maine, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Nevada, Puerto Rico, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Alabama, Mississippi and Tennessee), the Gannett Foundation initiatives were frequently first-time coalition efforts. An example of the former, Minnesota's literacy initiative (MALC) was developed in response to a recommendation of the Governor's Advisory Committee appointed by Governor Perpich in 1985. MALC was incorporated as a nonprofit organization governed by a board of directors. It was a "mature," fully functioning entity at the time of the Gannett Foundation initiative, providing a broad range of literacy activities and services. It enjoyed the active involvement of its board of directors.

Nevertheless, significant levels of pre-existing adult literacy activity, while important, was not an absolute determinant of how the project fared, as exemplified by the California and Washington initiatives, both of which faded after the close of their Literacy Challenge grants.

Even in those instances where it was readily apparent that the coalition and project activities had been developed specifically because of the availability of the Gannett Foundation funds, the outcomes at the end of the projects varied. In some cases (such as New Mexico, Puerto Rico, Nevada, Indiana, and Illinois), staff had been successful in locating other sources of funds and support (either inside or outside government funding) so that, at the conclusion of the Gannett Foundation support, they were able to continue adult literacy activities. For example, the New Mexico project, a nonprofit organization, was able to continue operations thanks to the support of the State Legislature and the interest of the Governor and the Governor's wife. Similarly, although in a different venue, the Nevada project was able to continue through the "institutionalization" of the staff and project activities into the State Library and Archives. Conversely, some of the projects which began with "face value" support (as reflected in the endorsement letters included with the original proposals) were never able to integrate themselves into any type of ongoing support (for example, Massachusetts, Oregon, and Tennessee).

Only three of the projects (Puerto Rico, Connecticut, and Rhode Island) were not statewide in nature. In Puerto Rico the project was successful not only in the conduct of its activities but also in the garnering of broadly based support for future efforts. Although endorsements were provided by both state and city officials for the endeavor, the Connecticut project was targeted to low-income neighborhoods in a single city. The first year application was not funded, in part because it called for the involvement of a demonstration site while not identifying which community would be willing to participate. In the second year application, the proposed activities centered on the city of Bridgeport, a community with very high illiteracy and unemployment rates. The project, funded for one year, had some unique and quite interesting components, not the least of which was the involvement of a coalition of inner-city black churches in the recruitment and training of tutors and in the recruitment of and service to students. Unfortunately, communication between the proposal developers (located at the state level) and the project staff responsible for implementation (at the community level) faltered over time. While the project saw some successes during its lifespan, no commitments or mechanisms were put in place to ensure that the ground gained with the churches, students, and tutors was secured. As the conclusion of the Gannett Foundation grant neared, activities atrophied, staff were let go, and there was no expectation for continuation. A similar fate occurred in the Rhode Island project, which had been targeted to specific public housing units and worksites.

Although some generalizations can be made about the "readiness" of each state for its Gannett Foundation adult literacy efforts, in fact each of the state environments had its own unique story. Briefly included below is information taken from the proposals and the site visits.

Alabama. At the onset of the one year grant, the state had little state-level adult literacy activity. As reported in the proposal, efforts to hold a coordinated statewide conference in the year preceding the Gannett Foundation proposal were disjointed; no other coordinated statewide efforts had taken place. Created in response to the availability of the Gannett Foundation funds, this project concentrated on the "basics," such as information and referral; support for the dissemination of a services directory; publishing and dissemination of a monthly newsletter; support in the development of local coalitions and task forces; and the convening of two statewide conferences, and two workshops focused on rural needs and services.

Alaska. At the time of the proposal submission, the need for literacy services in Alaska was recognized. The lack of high schools in rural villages until 1978 had contributed to the illiteracy problems of the state. Even with schools available throughout Alaska, there were many older generations who were illiterate. Although adult basic education services had been provided by many communities for several years, only Anchorage and Fairbanks had literacy programs.

Alaska's economy fluctuates with the oil economy. When oil prices drop, all programs, including adult literacy efforts, are negatively affected. For example, in fiscal year 1987, statewide adult education funding received a 45 percent cut from the Legislature. As a result, adult learners being served by adult basic and literacy education programs dropped from 11,753 to 8,894. Not only were existing literacy programs cut, but plans to fund additional programs were shelved. As a result, budding literacy programs were turning to private sources of support. Through the Gannett Foundation project, the Coalition sought to provide a unified statewide training and technical assistance program to help strengthen programs and their services.

California. A diverse adult literacy system was in place at the time of the proposal submission. Faced with a large number of illiterates, and with a diverse population of immigrants as well, there were considerable pressures to provide ESL by diverting resources from traditional basic literacy classes. Problems included a lack of resources (although enormous amounts of money were spent on literacy) and a lack of coordination, reflective of the size and diversity of the service delivery system itself. In 1987, a literacy inventory found 1,104 providers serving 600,000 adult students, of which 79 percent were primarily for ESL instruction. Adult schools (operated by school districts) and community colleges provided most of the services. There were also approximately 800 community-based organizations providing literacy services, including California Literacy, Inc. (associated with Laubach Literacy Action) and Literacy Volunteers of America. The California Alliance for Literacy (CAL) is a statewide literacy coalition, formed in 1985 by the California State Librarian and the State Director of Adult, Alternative, and Continuing Education. The proposal was submitted by the State Department of Education, on behalf of the Alliance.

Connecticut. In 1985, Governor O'Neill appointed a 28-member Coalition for Literacy to review the extent of statewide literacy activities, promote awareness of the issue, and suggest relevant policy direction. The statewide Coalition actively provided direction and focus for the literacy effort by publishing a newsletter, initiating a hotline, and developing PSAs. Also in the mid-1980's, the Department of Education launched a five-year plan to improve basic skills and ESL programs by adopting a competency-based approach to manage student assessment and instruction. The objectives were to increase student achievement in literacy, English, and related skills while simultaneously improving student assessment.

In 1987, the Coalition issued a policy report which emphasized the creation of regional coalitions to enhance the delivery of literacy services at the metropolitan level. The grant request to the Gannett Foundation was designed to enhance that effort. In light of the evidence that the preponderance of undereducated adults were minorities who were poor and lived in urban areas, the Coalition for Literacy joined with Bridgeport's Mayor's Commission and Board of Education to request funds for a demonstration project in Bridgeport. It was clear that despite the sizable population requiring literacy or basic skills education, providers were not serving those most in need. The number of blacks and Hispanics participating in basic skills or literacy instruction were in no way proportional to the actual numbers in need in the community of Bridgeport.

Delaware. The relatively low adult educational level in Delaware, along with a rapid decline in jobs for semi-skilled workers, created an employment crisis during the recession of the early 1980s. The Governor's Economic Development Cabinet Council, recognizing the importance of the issue, launched a major study of hard-core unemployment in Delaware in the spring of 1986. One of the key findings was that the lack of a high school degree is one of the most common characteristics of hard-core unemployment.

The Delaware Coalition for Literacy (DCL), formed in 1985, is a statewide partnership (with 71 members) of educators, government officials, social service providers, business and labor leaders, and citizen volunteers. Its function is to coordinate literacy efforts and leadership in public awareness of literacy issues, working closely with the Adult/Community Education Division of the State Department of Public Instruction and the organizations that address adult education. The DCL brought together relevant individuals to write the State Literacy Plan, which was adopted by the Coalition in 1987.

Illinois. As a state with significant adult literacy efforts already taking place, Illinois had invested more than $8.5 million in local adult literacy activities through specific adult literacy appropriations for libraries, adult education, and job training in the two years preceding the Literacy Challenge grant application. As stated by the Illinois Literacy Council Chairman Jim Edgar in the original Gannett Foundation proposal submitted by Illinois: "Today the Illinois literacy effort is a model of initiative, leadership and cooperation. The need for literacy services in this state is great, but our effort to combat illiteracy is strong."

The Illinois Literacy Resource Development Project (ILRDP) evolved within this extensive, well-developed adult literacy environment. From 1984 to 1986, coordinated funding through the Illinois State Board of Education and the Secretary of State's Literacy Grant Program resulted in the development of a diversified network of more than 250 literacy providers. The Illinois Literacy Council, established in 1984 by Governor James Thompson, brought together representatives from state agencies, community-based and volunteer organizations, and the private sector to provide visibility, direction, and support to these local and regional literacy programs. By the time of the original Gannett Foundation proposal submission, the ILRDP needed funds to provide technical and professional assistance to this large number of provider agencies to meet the growing demands of programs development. The next phase ("building upon our strong foundation") was to concentrate on the creation of long-term support from both the public and private sectors. Hence, the ILRDP's focus on resource development.

Indiana. The Indiana Coalition was established by law in 1986, the evolution of a long-standing Governor's task force. The state had high concentrations of illiterates, with approximately 34 percent of adults without a high school diploma and a high school dropout rate of 22 percent (in 1986). Indiana also had concentrations of non-English speakers in both rural and urban areas, including settled migrant workers, refugees, and immigrants. As stated in the proposal, the single greatest factor in the establishment of the Coalition was the serious negative impact that functional illiteracy and low educational attainment levels were perceived to be having on the state's efforts to revitalize the economy. The link between educational level and economic progress became apparent to the state's leaders, and upgrading the educational system became the state's top agenda item.

Literacy instruction is offered through many diverse groups. The state has no community college network, and Adult Basic Education programs are provided through schools, businesses, public vocational schools, independent vocational technical colleges, libraries, volunteer programs, and union halls, among others. This diversity has both strengths and weaknesses: for example, community-sensitive programs, but broadly scattered responsibility and accountability.

The Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition is a legislatively created partnership among the Office of the Governor, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Director of the State Library. The statute making the Coalition an official entity specified 16 categories of membership that must be represented on the Coalition. A total of 35 members served on two-year, staggered terms. The Coalition is bipartisan; two different-party Governors (Governor Orr, originally, and Governor Bayh, currently) have been supportive of adult literacy.

Kentucky. The Governor's Commission on Literacy was created by Executive Order of Governor Martha Layne Collins in 1985; in 1988, the Kentucky General Assembly passed legislation making the Commission a permanent agency of the education and humanities cabinet. The Commission in turn developed in 1986 a companion organization, the Kentucky Foundation for Literacy, Inc., a nonprofit private corporation (which received the Gannett Foundation grant). These two entities worked closely with the state's Department of Education and Kentucky Educational Television.

Maine. The Coalition was originally convened in response to the availability of the Gannett Foundation funds; the application was sponsored by the State Department of Educational and Cultural Services. It evolved within a exceedingly rural state and within the framework of town governments. The intent of the Literacy Challenge project was to convert the state's PLUS Task Force into an ongoing, expanded coalition. Eventually, the Coalition grew into a 501(c)(3). It is still supported by state government as well as the corporate and media sectors.

Massachusetts. The Massachusetts project (MCAL) entered the literacy environment of Massachusetts at a time there was considerable activity and interest being expressed by both the public and private sectors in literacy issues. Soon after MCAL's formation, Governor Michael Dukakis announced his Literacy Initiative, a multi-pronged approach to addressing adult literacy. In addition to the Governor's Literacy Initiative, several state agencies were engaged in literacy enhancement efforts. Organizational diversity existed throughout the state, with some 300 agencies on the Coalition's initial list of service providers. All in all, the state was a relatively rich environment of terms of ongoing activity.

Minnesota. Minnesota's adult literacy activities are among the oldest, most highly developed, and most highly regarded among the states. Each of its four participating agencies has been a major literacy provider for several years. Nevertheless, adult literacy has not been regarded as a high priority issue within either the state government or the business community.

Mississippi. The State Literacy Coalition evolved because of the first Literacy Challenge RFP. Considering the estimated percentage of adult illiterates (22%, almost 400,000 individuals), the percentage of adults (46%) without a high school diploma, and rank in the nation (47th) in having a high school educated, trained workforce), it was clear that Mississippi was among the most economically needy states applying for Gannett Foundation funds. Only approximately one percent of this (needy) population was being served. Moreover, the creation of specific adult literacy programs was recent. In 1985, a system of adult literacy programs was established and subsequently coordinated by the Mississippi State Department of Education. As a result of JTPA funding, a full-time coordinator was hired specifically to oversee adult literacy programs, of which there were 28 in early 1988. The state used the five-tiered Laubach Literacy Method for instruction. Also in 1985, the Governor appointed a 21-member adult learner task force to address the problems of adult literacy and adult postsecondary enrollment.

A major step forward occurred in developing a coalition when Mississippi prepared a Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge grant application for the first year of funding. This was the first time that representatives from such a broad spectrum of governmental agencies, professional and civic organizations, private enterprise, and religious denominations came together to discuss a statewide literacy agenda and to identify and prioritize immediate and long-term goals. Although the first Literacy Challenge grant application was unsuccessful, the state had begun the planning process to develop a coalition, and the priorities developed for the statewide literacy agenda were integrated within the goals and activities of the project eventually funded by the Gannett Foundation.

Nevada. The Nevada Coalition was created in response to the Literacy Challenge grant opportunity. With no statewide adult literacy activities in place, the developing Coalition was the state's first serious attempt to undertake statewide coordination of literacy efforts. In the period before the Coalition was formed, the PLUS campaign had generated more interest in literacy activity than ever before. Few programs, however, were able to keep pace with demands because of Nevada's small number of tutor trainers; lack of funds to provide resources to help small, outlying communities; and absence of a central coordinating authority. Potential volunteers frequently contacted state and local agencies for training, but because the rural population was so sparse and dispersed, tutor training was nonexistent in remote areas.

The Nevada Department of Education administered ABE and ESL programs and communicated through informal channels with volunteer organizations. The Nevada State Library and Archives provided consulting statewide for libraries involved in literacy activities and coordinated informally with literacy agencies. In June 1987, the Nevada State Legislature approved $220,000 to help fight illiteracy in Nevada over the next two years. The money was earmarked for funding adult literacy programs, to be distributed among community colleges and nonprofit organizations. Literacy programs for adults reading below the sixth grade level were targeted. Unlike many other states, the feeling in Nevada is that the state is small enough to be able to "get a handle on the problems" and to know everyone who is relevant to a particular issue.

New Mexico. In 1985, the Education Forum of New Mexico, a nonprofit citizen organization, sponsored a study conducted by the University of New Mexico to examine illiteracy. The state's stagnant, high illiteracy rate was attributed to the rural nature of the state's population; the state's large geographic area and small population; the extent of bilingualism or monolingualism in languages other than English; and the low per capita income. Government funding specifically earmarked for literacy was secured for the first time during 1988-89.

The relative isolation of programs in New Mexico prevented extensive networking without money to operate telephone or computer linkages. The Coalition for Literacy, which was incorporated as a 501(c)(3) in 1987, received considerable support from the Governor's Office and the Office of the First Lady.

New York. A large, diverse adult literacy system exists in New York. The State Literacy Council (SLC), a 501(c)(3) nonprofit corporation, was established in 1984 as a subcommittee of the existing Adult Learning Services Council, which advises the State Education Commissioner on adult learning issues. Its mission is to affect statewide policy and to support or initiate activities that ensure that all New York State adults become literate.

Oregon. The Oregon coalition formed in response to the Gannett Foundation initiative. At the time of the proposal submission no single statewide agency provided for coordination and quality control services. Oregon's economy during the five years before the proposal had been devastated by the effects of high interest rates on the timber industry. In southern and coastal areas of the state, unemployment rates of 20 percent or higher were not uncommon. Oregon resources, both public and private, were limited. In 1986, some public schools were closing because of a lack of funding, and industries were leaving the state. Public support of education at all levels was cut back. A portion of the adult illiteracy population was created by the influx of immigrants with limited English skills and little or no previous schooling. Oregon is a major resettlement area for incoming Southeast Asians, as well as a stopping place for Hispanic migrants. A lack of basic skills frustrated immigrants' attempts to find work and become productive members of their communities. These factors plus the high unemployment rate, the need for a more skilled workforce, and the continuing language and literacy needs of a growing non-native population meant that the number of illiterate adults would continue to grow unless there was intervention; hence, the stage was set for the expansion of literacy services.

There were two major sources of free basic literacy instruction in Oregon: Adult Basic Education administered by the State Department of Education and offered through community colleges; and Laubach tutoring, offered through Oregon Literacy, Inc. Several local private organizations also provided reading instruction. Most of Oregon is rural, and literacy providers found adults hard to reach and hard to serve because of the sparsity of the population and the state's significant geographic diversity. In addition, the history of adult literacy tutoring in Oregon had been characterized by a lack of understanding and communication between community college adult basic education efforts and local volunteer literacy councils; the proposal stated that in some communities the two groups would not even communicate with one another. As one Task Force member commented in her year-end evaluation, "The issue of building literacy coalitions, as opposed to providing assistance for providing volunteer training, has to be a primary focus before all other services can fall into place."

Pennsylvania. The Pennsylvania Coalition was developed in response to the availability of Literacy Challenge funds, even though Pennsylvania State University's Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy had been the recipient of a 1986-1987 Gannett Foundation grant for Adult Literacy and Technology. At the time of the initial Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge grant application, Pennsylvania lacked a coalition of service providers across the state. (Strong local coalitions existed only in Philadelphia and Pittsburgh.) The need for such a coalition was emphasized by the state's economy. The state had a high percentage of primary industries that converted raw materials into man-made products; these were industries whose technologies were rapidly becoming outdated, and in many locations were dying. All across Pennsylvania workers were unemployed and in need of higher level skills and job retraining. A common need of municipalities across the state was for adult education efforts to provide the basic skills component in training and retraining unemployed and underemployed adults. The incoming Democratic governor, Robert Casey, promised to invest "20 million dollars over the next four years to fight illiteracy."

In addition to the direct economic distress of the state, Pennsylvania ranked fourth in the nation in 1986 in having the largest number of adults without a high school diploma (approximately 30 percent of the adult population). Until passage of the Adult Literacy Act in September 1986, Pennsylvania ranked last among the states in support of Adult Basic Education funds because it had never directly allocated any state monies for programs.

Both Governor Casey and his wife, Ellen, supported statewide literacy efforts and expressed their commitment by selecting the State Coalition as the recipient of their annual fundraisers "Pennsylvania, Yes!" in 1988 and again in 1989. Senior representatives from key state agencies participated on the Governing Board of the Coalition.

Puerto Rico. The Puerto Rico project, one of three projects not statewide in nature, was developed in response to the Gannett Foundation initiative. Adult literacy was, and remains, a major priority of the Department of Education, particularly in its relationship to economic development, the overall levels of poverty, the large numbers of individuals moving back and forth from the mainland, and the bilingual nature of its population. Of the children who start school, only approximately 52 percent actually graduate. There is a high degree of support at the community level for adult literacy. The reasons for this support range from concrete, such as economic development, to common personal motivations such as wanting to read the Bible or read letters from relatives who have moved to the mainland.

Rhode Island. The Rhode Island effort was developed in response to the Literacy Challenge grants program. In the two years before the Literacy Challenge initiative, most literacy activity by public and nonprofit, private groups was funded by the Department of Education and was at the grades 9-11 educational level. Various agencies, including six community-based organizations, provided services. Services were available in classroom settings as well as through a "drop-in" system which permitted adults to obtain individualized instruction in both urban and rural areas. Two organizations, Literacy Volunteers of America/Rhode Island and the Rhode Island College Adult Academy, worked with adults having low literacy skills. Federal funds were supplemented with state appropriations and distributed to agencies and organizations through a competitive application process.

A major actor in the literacy arena was the Rhode Island Adult Literacy Council, formed in 1984 at the request of the Governor. (The Council was not the sponsoring agency for the initiative; rather, the project was developed and overseen by the Department of Elementary and Secondary Education.) Meeting six times a year, the Council is a statewide coalition of individuals and organizations from the public, private, and nonprofit sectors. A Three-Year Plan for Adult Education (1985-88) cited three major goals that the State Adult Education Programs addressed, including aiding undereducated adults to acquire the basic literacy skills necessary to function effectively.

Tennessee. In Tennessee, several public and private agencies and organizations provided literacy services statewide. As stated in the proposal, the need for adult literacy services was great throughout most of Tennessee, but it was especially acute in rural and mountain counties. These counties had the highest grade school dropout rates according to the 1980 census. Historically, communication, coordination, and collaboration among and between the various entities having literacy interests had been "at best, sporadic, fragmented, and limited in scope." The opportunity to apply for the Gannett Foundation grant served as a major catalyst in bringing together public and private agencies in a collaborative effort.

With the Better Schools Program, Tennessee had been a national pioneer and model of improving children's educational systems. The Program was an initiative of Governor Lamar Alexander, and its significant level of funding indicated the priority it had in the state. Efforts to combat adult illiteracy and more generally educate adults in basic subjects had been less successful.

Washington. Gannett Foundation funds were requested to support the first staff for a coalition which had been operating informally for three years. At the time of the proposal submission, various private, nonprofit, and government, (local, state, and federal) agencies were sponsoring, funding, and/or operating literacy services or programs of differing scope and size, serving a variety of populations, and operating with a range of resources. Considerable informal cooperation was occurring as well. Almost all of these diverse "elements" wanted increased communication, coordination, and networking. In preparing to write the proposal to the Gannett Foundation, representatives of the Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy (WACAL), Washington Literacy, PLUS, the Department of Corrections, the Department of Social and Health Services, and the Department of Employment Security convened to identify priorities reflecting short-term, long-term, and continuing needs. The priority statements were guidelines to be used in the development and improvement of adult literacy services at all levels, particularly at the statewide level. With regard to workforce literacy, literacy initiatives enjoyed the support of the Governor; this was reflected by his participation as a keynote speaker at a business and literacy conference and his role in formally appointing new members to the Coalition.

3. Boards of Directors and Advisory Bodies

As noted earlier, the care and maintenance of boards and advisory groups was just one of the many complex challenges which a successful coalition had to confront to maximize its chances for organizational survival. The involvement and commitment of such entities must go beyond supporting the program and mission of the organization to include its fiscal survival as well. Because of the coalition requirement of the Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge grants program, all of the projects had to form some sort of advisory group; if a 501(c)(3), the sponsoring agency had a Board of Directors. Not surprisingly, the nature of these entities and how they actually functioned varied significantly.

In those instances where the project was conducted by a nonprofit organization (for example, New Mexico and Minnesota), the oversight "group" was indeed a Board of Directors as defined and required by 501(c)(3) status. Although the composition of such Boards may vary, all members are assumed to have the "best interests" of the organization in mind as a primary objective. Hence, the potential for a project director to reach out and receive real assistance (lobbying, fundraising, problem solving, and accessing others) from such a group is enhanced. To the extent that a Board of Directors is well functioning, the odds for the survival of the organization are improved.

Within the government-sponsored coalitions funded by the Literacy Challenge grants, the role of the advisory groups was made more complex by the influence usually exerted by the "lead" agency. Since individuals sitting on such advisory groups frequently represented their own agencies or organizations, they potentially had mixed and "vested" interests in project activities. They were more likely to see the coalition's goals as secondary to their own. The danger is that individuals who sit on such advisory groups do not "own" the initiative in the same sense. Hence, when funding difficulties (one of the most frequent and vexing problems occurring in the projects) emerged, project staff were often "on their own" to solve issues and problems. In some instances, for example the Alabama Literacy Coalition, staff concluded that not enough time had been spent on the development of Coalition member involvement. They speculated that more nurturance from the staff might have led to more commitment to the initiative, which in turn might have improved their chances for continued survival beyond the Literacy Challenge award.

The size and complexity of the boards and advisory groups reflected great differences. Among the largest groups were those associated with Indiana, Maine, Minnesota, Mississippi, and Tennessee. The

Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition (IALC) was a legislatively created partnership among the Offices of the Governor, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction, and the Director of the State Library. The statute making the Coalition an official entity specified 16 categories of membership that must be represented on the Coalition. A total of 35 members served two-year, staggered terms. Every statewide provider organization had at least one representative, along with business, the Legislature, professional associations, and other groups. Its Chair was appointed by the Governor. The IALC's ongoing management was handled by its Administrative Committee, which consisted of the Coalition chair, the representatives of the three co-sponsoring organizations, and the chairs of the Coalition's standing committees. The work of the Coalition was carried out by its committees and task forces. The Coalition met bimonthly.

In Maine, the Coalition was directed by three groups with equal powers: a Board of Directors, elected officers, and a liaison from the Maine Department of Educational and Cultural Services. Members included representatives from each local or regional task force, and representatives from the Departments of Human Services, Corrections, Mental Health and Mental Retardation, and Labor, and the State Library. In addition, membership was open to all with an interest in promoting adult literacy. The Coalition was organized into six committees: Publicity and Media; Tutor Training and In-Service; Student Recruitment; Public Schools Outreach; Staff Development; and Workforce Literacy. A Steering Committee was composed of the Project Coordinator, committee chairs, a representative from the Guy Gannett Pro-Literacy Project, representatives from the Division of Adult and Community Education, LVA/Maine, social service agencies, and local literacy coalitions.

In 1989, the Maine Coalition began steps to become an independent, incorporated organization, including the adoption of by-laws and election of its first set of officers.

The Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign (MALC) was an independent, nonprofit organization incorporated in July 1986. With 30 members, the Board consisted of representatives from the community, business, philanthropy, and literacy provider systems and programs. The MALC Board was a very active, well functioning Board of Directors that provided hands-on oversight of the organization, including the Gannett Foundation project. The Executive Director of the Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign staffed the statewide Literacy Coalition.

Housed in the Mississippi State Department of Education, the Mississippi project formed an Advisory Committee at the start of the project with 34 members representing a broad cross section of both the private and public sectors. Julie Mabus, Mississippi's First Lady, was the Chairperson; membership on the Coalition was extended by the First Lady. The first Coalition meeting was held in May 1988 at the Governor's Mansion. The Advisory Committee established an ambitious agenda for itself, including 11 specific responsibilities, such as pursuing funding support for literacy efforts, conducting on-site visits and/or fact-finding hearings, and targeting communities with the greatest need for local coalitions and services. Task Force groups formed by the Advisory Committee included Fund Raising, Communications, Long-Range Planning, Legislative Support, and Program Support.

As a Coalition formed under the auspices of a nonprofit organization, the Tennessee Literacy Coalition (TLC) functioned with a strong Oversight Committee, which had an executive committee. The Oversight Committee was composed of representatives of the TLC, state agencies (Education, Human Services, Corrections), the State Library, the Board of Regents, the State Board of Education, local school systems, business and industry, the State General Assembly, ACTION, and the TCEA. Seven task forces were convened to conduct project activities. As would be expected, the task forces functioned with varying degrees of success and productivity; unfortunately, the fiscal fundraising task force did not function.

In addition to Indiana and Mississippi, several other states (Alabama, Connecticut, Nevada, New Mexico, Pennsylvania, Kentucky and Washington) had advisory bodies or boards of directors that included representatives of the Governor's Office. In Alabama, housed in the Public Library Service, the oversight group was chaired by the Governor and included 22 members representing business, education, government, and private sector literacy providers.

Since the Connecticut project was targeted to a single city (rather than being statewide in nature), a special Advisory Board was created. The Advisory Board was composed of members from the state's Coalition for Literacy (a 28-member coalition appointed in 1985 by Governor O'Neill to review the statewide literacy activities, promote literacy awareness, and suggest policy directions), major literacy providers in Bridgeport, a representative of the Literacy Assistants (a special component of the project), the chief community advocacy agencies such as tenants' groups and parent advisory groups, and three citizens-at-large who represented the target student population.

In Nevada, a Literacy Advisory Board was formed to oversee the project, handle legal matters, monitor expenditures, and promote funding of literacy activities. The Board included representatives from urban literacy programs, rural literacy interests, private business, libraries, state agencies, local government agencies, the Reno Gazette-Journal, and the Nevada Corporation in Las Vegas. The wife of the Governor and wife of a United States Senator were also active participants. Task Forces were formed to focus on publicity, funding, and workforce literacy; a Task Force on the Three Year Plan was also formed, using information collected via the literacy needs assessment to develop a statewide literacy agenda.

The New Mexico Coalition for Literacy (NMCL) was incorporated as a 501(c)(3) nonprofit organization in December 1987 under the auspices of Katherine Carruthers, the wife of New Mexico's Governor Garrey Carruthers. To improve linkages and coordination, the Coalition applied for and became the official state organization for Laubach Literacy Action and for Literacy Volunteers of America, Inc. NMCL was formed following a statewide conference and the convening of a steering committee to determine the best way to coordinate the numerous ongoing activities within the state. The Board consisted of 39 members representing a broad range of community, educational, and professional organizations. It established working committees, for example, the Planning Committee, to carry out objectives, particularly those related to public awareness activities.

Housed in the Pennsylvania State University, Department of Education, Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy, the Pennsylvania Coalition (PSCAL) was directed by a State Coalition Governing Board. The Governing Board included active participation from high level staff from all key state agencies, as well as representatives from the private sector, reflecting the various regions and constituencies of the state as fully as possible. The Governing Board's stated purpose was to integrate multi-agency involvement and to connect local networks to senior levels of state government. Much of the work was accomplished through informal committees, including the Advocacy Committee, the Local Coalition Support Committee, and the Planning for Self-Sufficiency/Membership Committee. The degree of involvement on the part of the Governing Board was difficult to assess although the State Coalition clearly had high level state support.

The process of writing and adopting bylaws in August 1987 helped the Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy (WACAL) clarify and refine its goals and establish long-range priorities. The bylaws set out a standing committee structure; defined the duties, responsibilities, and terms of office for officers; and established procedures for the nomination and election of officers as well as the addition of new members.

Expansion and solidification of the existing Coalition (by broadening representation from public agencies and including representation from the private sector) was seen as a key component in strengthening WACAL, and therefore the effective delivery of literacy efforts across the state. The Coalition sought official sanction by the Governor for the expanded Coalition, including gubernatorial appointment of members. Three new members were eventually confirmed; these represented four organizations (Washington State Labor Council, the Washington Federation of Teachers, the Washington Bar Association, and the State Board for Vocational Education).

Staff described the WACAL Board as a "working Board" that was actively involved with the organization, particularly in the area of fundraising. From the beginning, the Board included a very significant public sector representation including an individual from the Office of the Governor.

Other relatively large boards or advisory groups (generally 20 to 30 members) were reported by Illinois, Kentucky, Massachusetts, California, Tennessee, New York, and Washington. While the specific compositions of these groups were unique to each state, it was common to find representatives of business, education, government, private sector providers, colleges and universities, libraries, legislatures, professional associations, media, and community organizations. Some of the more unusual representatives included tenants groups (Connecticut), church groups (Connecticut and Kentucky), corrections (Maine, Alaska, and New York), and unions (New York and Illinois).

The smallest boards or advisory groups were reported by Puerto Rico, Rhode Island, Oregon, Alaska and Delaware (with an eight-member Board of Directors). Alaska's project was sponsored by Nine State Enterprises, a nonprofit organization with nine Board of Director members and the additional ex-officio participation of three state agency representatives. The Alaska Literacy Challenge Coalition Steering Committee was composed of the Literacy Coordinator; three trainers; representatives of the Department of Education, ABE, JTPA, and the State Library; and seven additional representatives of literacy programs or adult education associations.

Primarily led by Oregon State University, the Oregon Coalition also included the Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory, Oregon Literacy Inc., and the Oregon Department of Education's Community College Division. A Project Development Committee was created, composed of the Library Development Administrator; the Director of the Tri-County Library Literacy Project; the Technical Services Specialist for the JTPA; and the Adult Services Coordinator, Multnomah County Library. The Development Committee then assumed an advisory role in the planning and development of the project's activities. The Task Force met quarterly to review and monitor the progress of the project's goals, objectives, and outcomes.

The Puerto Rico project functioned at a regional level. While there were extraordinary efforts to involve local participation (with significant success), the project itself was an initiative of the Department of Education. To provide oversight, the Education Department formed a planning committee consisting of five people knowledgeable about program design. This group, along with the Project Director, became the Central Task Force. A Task Force was also established at the Arecibo site, which included members from institutions and agencies which work with out-of-school youth and adults.

CHAPTER FOUR

Outcomes of the Coalitions

From the beginning, the Gannett Foundation was concerned that the coalitions which they were about to fund have the highest potential for sustained system expansion, long-term impact, and in most cases, organizational survival. Among the required proposal contents was "a plan for continuing the project once Gannett Foundation funding has been used." Hence, in theory, all of the projects had to articulate objective, strategic thinking about long-term funding. As might have been expected, some succeeded; unfortunately, most did not.

In reviewing the "status" of the coalitions after the completion of the Gannett Foundation activities and funds, it is exceedingly complex to analyze the outcomes; nevertheless, according to final communications with the projects, the following three general groups can be discerned: (1) those which seem to have a reasonably good chance to continue their efforts, products, and/or philosophies (of which there are seven); (2) those for which the future is more uncertain (of which there are five); and (3) those whose prospects for continued activities seem highly unlikely.

A. Coalition Survival: Likely

Coalitions which seemed most likely to survive beyond the Gannett Foundation funding are Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Nevada, New Mexico, Puerto Rico, and Minnesota. All of these states reflected high levels of activity and high levels of success in meeting their goals and objectives. It should be noted, however, that even the strongest of the initiatives are "fluid" in that they are subject to fiscal downturns in their states, as well as leadership changes, political events, and other uncertainties.

1. Illinois

At the end of the two years of Gannett Foundation funding, the Illinois Coalition (ILRDP) was able to secure funding from the Chicago Tribune Charities and the Illinois State Board of Education-Adult Education Section. Other funds had been requested from foundations. The ILRDP planned to continue selling its manuals and intended to examine the feasibility of offering its services to business and industry at cost.

Although at the time of the site visit funding for the future was precarious, the Illinois initiative continued to receive funds and to function. The Board added six more members, representing the unions, libraries, community colleges, the adult learner, the private (business) sector, and local providers. The ILRDP was renamed the Illinois Literacy Resource Development Center when it became a 501(c)(3) in 1990. As such, the Center received funding from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation to focus on family literacy issues in Illinois. Staff also remained interested in, and involved with, workplace literacy issues as well as ongoing state coordination efforts.

2. Indiana

At the time of the site visit, two state staff lines looked solid for the future, providing continued Coalition activities within the Indiana Department of Education. Coalition staff (and other staff from the Department of Education) hoped, with the help of Governor Evan Bayh's wife, Susan, to receive additional operating funds from the Legislature. The Indiana Literacy Resource Center also looked reasonably solid with its major source of support coming from federal ABE Special Projects funds. A recent outcome of Coalition activity was the setting up of an Archives at the Resource Center to assure that the products developed from past projects remain available.

3. Maine

At the time of the site visit, staff from the Maine State Literacy Coalition (MSLC) were optimistic about the future of the Coalition. The Coalition remains relatively independent yet continues to be supported by the state government, primarily the Education Department. The issue of literacy seems to have both caught the imagination of people and met a real need in Maine where, although many traditional businesses are being lost, many new ones are being gained. The unemployment rate in the late 1980s was approximately three percent. The radio, television, and print media have been particularly supportive and have cooperated with one another in supporting adult literacy.

Adult literacy in Maine enjoys support at all levels, including the fact that the Governor declared 1990 "Literacy Year." The adult education budget has been preserved, and key elements like eliminating fees for GED programs were instituted during a time of particularly austere state budgets.

4. Nevada

In the fall of 1987, the Legislature approved funding to the State Library for Coalition staffing and facilities but not for travel, printing, postage, and materials. From the beginning of the project, staff and Board members had focused on the need to establish and secure a public/private in-state funding base for the Coalition. As stated in correspondence of January 1988:

> Continuation of activities stimulated by the Literacy Challenge has been an overriding concern. This is a major topic at every Board meeting—at our last Board meeting members cast a vote of support for continuation of leadership in the State Library through addition of two new literacy staff positions. The State Librarian has written to the Governor requesting permission to add the positions to the (state) budget.

The Coalition staff further explained that their optimism for future long-term support for literacy programming in Nevada resulted from the fact that they had carefully laid the groundwork for approaching the Legislature: "We will be able to justify our programs with statistics, and more importantly, personal success stories."

By the beginning of the Bonus Grant (Year 3 for Nevada), the Coalition had secured staff stability through funding from the state budget. The State Librarian is committed to adult literacy issues and to the institutionalization of literacy concerns. The new State Library to be built over the next few years includes space set aside specifically for the Literacy Coalition. Funds requested from the Gannett Foundation were targeted to non-personnel expenses such as production of the volunteer management manual and the Stories and More collection, postage, supplies, printing, travel, and trainers' fees. Staff continue to seek outside funds for the wide variety of activities that the Coalition would like to support since state funds are limited to the two staff positions.

5. New Mexico

Despite the difficulties associated with fundraising, at the time of the site visit, staff were very excited about the progress which the Coalition was making in facilitating the expansion of the literacy system. The vast distances between program sites presented challenges, but the Coalition was committed to the expansion of local providers and hence continued to search for additional materials and resources to distribute to them. As stated in its Final Report, submitted in November 1990, the organization has grown substantially, and the literacy initiative in New Mexico has taken several steps forward. The State Legislature voted to appropriate funds for adult literacy projects, to flow through the Coalition in 1989-90 and 1990-91; also, the Coalition was successful in its request for legislative funding for 1991-1992. The Coalition will receive $300,000 for community-based projects.

In addition to funds from the State Legislature, the Coalition received support and funds from the state Adult Basic Education program (for training and technical assistance, and to upgrade the apprentice program); JTPA (for data collection and information dissemination, including the re-issuing of the statewide Resource Directory); KOAT-TV, the New Mexico ABC affiliate (underwriting the Coalition's statewide hotline); and a variety of other private contributors.

6. Puerto Rico

At the time of the site visit, the original demonstration site at Arecibo continued to provide service and enjoyed considerably community support. At a town meeting, held in response to the WRI site visit, attendees all reported that volunteer efforts were ongoing. Further, officials at the Arecibo adult learning center indicated that the volunteer effort is well integrated with adult education as a whole.

It was the original intention of the project to serve as demonstration sites for the development of program components and materials which would have broad replication potential to the rest of Puerto Rico. The Department of Education officials indicated that, assuming effective results, the Department would eventually incorporate the model into its regular adult education literacy programs throughout the remaining regions of the Island. Data and findings were to be disseminated at both state and national levels. Adult education remains a high priority for the future.

The Department of Education has set the broadening of educational and cultural services for undereducated youth and adults as one of its prime goals. An intensive literacy plan, using the coordination of efforts of the heads of departments, agencies, private enterprise, and educational organizations, has been established.

7. Minnesota

The Minnesota initiative was developed by four mature, well-functioning agencies, each bringing to the project unique skills and credentials. All four of the participating organizations—The Technology for Literacy Center, The Learning Disabilities Association, The Minnesota Literacy Coalition, and the Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign—were active and relatively financially stable at the conclusion of the Gannett Foundation grant.

As a caveat, it should be noted that the Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign (MALC), while continuing well beyond the cessation of the Gannett Foundation funds, was not intended to continue indefinitely. Rather, MALC was created with a five-year "sunset" provision, established at its inception by its Board of Directors which includes representatives from the two foundations that have been its primary funding sources. Having completed most of its original goals, and located other appropriate organizations to carry on its remaining functions, MALC was on schedule to close in June of 1991.

Summary

In sum, the seven projects briefly described above were able to use their Gannett Foundation funds not just to conduct project activities, but also to strengthen their own organizational positions. As stated concisely by the Executive Director of the New Mexico Coalition:

> It is critical to note that the Gannett Foundation funding gave the Coalition the start-up funds it required to begin to grow into a dynamic statewide organization. We attribute our growing success in providing training and technical assistance and in aiding pilot projects to lessons learned during the Gannett Foundation pilot project funding. The ability to muster support for the legislative funding was provided in large part by the establishment of full-time staff under the Gannett Foundation Grant. In short, the Gannett Foundation Challenge Grant allowed us the baseline support to develop a strong, independent statewide literacy coalition with a broad constituency and an effective service policy.

B. Coalition Survival: Uncertain

Those states in which future Coalition activities seemed less certain are : Alaska, Delaware, Kentucky, Pennsylvania, and Mississippi.

1. Alaska

During the period of the Gannett Foundation grants, the sponsoring agency for the Alaska Literacy Coalition, Nine Star Enterprises, was a well-established, functioning nonprofit agency pursuing "soft" consultant and contract dollars, primarily from the Alaska Department of Education and JTPA funds. In addition to adult literacy initiatives, Nine Star is involved in vocational and work preparation programs. At the time of the site visit, Nine Star Enterprises itself was in fairly good financial shape for the foreseeable future. Nevertheless, with almost all monies coming from these two state entities, the President was acutely aware that his funding was fragile. Having experienced the fiscal downturn of 1986-87, his concerns also reflected the unpredictability of the state's economy.

Literacy advocates have been able to build a small interest base within both the legislative and executive branches of government in Alaska. Some basic activities which were begun with Literacy Challenge grant funds were being continued by existing agencies, but Coalition activities themselves were for the most part at a standstill.

2. Delaware

In the middle of the grant period the DCL was applying for 501(c)(3) status which it did eventually receive. When the Gannett Foundation project year was completed, the DCL received funds from the state and from United Way. United Way funds are used to support a literacy coordinator who works part-time for the Coalition and part-time for United Way. The recruitment of students remains a major activity.

3. Kentucky

Adult literacy is considered a priority in Kentucky, which has the highest rate of illiteracy in the nation. At the time of the site visit, the state was establishing a separate cabinet-level department for "Work Force Development," reflective of the ongoing attention of state government and the Governor. The new Department will encompass adult education, vocational education, the Job Training Partnership Act program, and others including family literacy initiatives and the Kentucky Literacy Commission itself. The Governor's Literacy Commission will be incorporated into the new Department.

Materials produced by KET remain available for use. The TAG process will continue with funding from the Foundation for Literacy, although not as a formal, separate program. The Foundation will continue its association with the state agencies and its pursuit of private sector funds.

4. Pennsylvania

As early as December 1987, the Coalition began discussing the question of self-sufficiency after the Gannett Foundation funding ceased. The conclusion was to try to support the Coalition (at an approximately $40,000 level within the Institute) with both private and public sector money and grants, especially ABE 310 funds. A special Task Force on Strategic Planning was established to clarify the role of the Coalition and to design funding strategies. Significant efforts were associated with the Governor's two fundraising events, "Pennsylvania Yes!". Both the Governor and his wife played supportive roles in the efforts of the Coalition to make itself known and to generate additional funds.

At the end of the Gannett Foundation second year (March 1998), the Coalition was in reasonably good shape financially. Since the local coalitions did not fully use their funds, and the publicity and teleconferencing monies were not used, approximately $27,000 remained of the 1987-88 grant; the Coalition requested of the Gannett Foundation use of these funds to continue Coalition activities and was approved to do so.

At the time of the site visit in late 1989, the Coalition was operating with staff support funded under an Appalachian Regional Commission and Pennsylvania Department of Commerce grant to the Institute. Using approximately $10,000 available from the second round of "Pennsylvania Yes!" funds, small grants again were to be made to local coalitions from the state Coalition.

The Governing Board was exploring options for future funding, and the State itself was exploring methods of funding the Coalition. In addition, the Pennsylvania Women's Club had adopted the state Coalition for support in 1990, and local women's clubs were working with local coalitions. The Director of the Coalition hoped that statewide funding would reach approximately $50,000 from the relationship with the Women's Club. Although a local coalition newsletter was being published, and periodic regional and statewide training were being provided, much of the activity was informal and infrequent.

5. Mississippi

As was true in all of the other sites, the Mississippi project evolved within the context of other political and policy activities at the state level. The project was housed in the Mississippi State Department of Education; the project director was hired from Gannett Foundation funds. Membership in the Coalition was extended by the First Lady of Mississippi, Julie Mabus. When the grant ran out, the project director was let go.

At the time of the site visit, Coalition activities were modest. The three tutor intervention models were "at a standstill" awaiting the availability of VISTA Volunteers. Nevertheless, there was some hope that eventual expansion of the models would occur since there were potential resources to be tapped in the Governor's Office and also because staff felt that the sponsors of the three programs were invested in their continued operation.

The evolution of the Governor's Office for Literacy had been enhanced by the arrival of a nationally known literacy expert, Dr. Karl Haigler. Julie Mabus has remained very involved with Mississippi's adult literacy efforts, and is particularly involved with the Mississippi Literacy Foundation, a 501(c)(3) created to attract private funds.

Summary

The five projects described above have been able to obtain funding from diverse sources to continue at least some of the activities begun under the Gannett Foundation grants. It remains uncertain, however, whether these sources will continue their funding and/or whether state budgets will be able to provide additional funds to keep these projects alive.

C. Coalition Survival: Unlikely

The third group is composed of those states whose activities had virtually (or literally) ceased at the end of Gannett Foundation funding: Alabama, California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, New York, Oregon, Rhode Island, Tennessee and Washington. This is not to say that residual impacts may not still lie with those individuals and organizations initially touched by the Gannett Foundation initiative, but they are not evident in an discernible fashion.

1. Alabama

The Alabama Literacy Coalition was created in response to the availability of the Literacy Challenge grants program. The proposal submitted by the Coalition indicated the intent to seek additional and future funding from the State Legislature and from the corporate sector to sustain ongoing activity and growth. Although there were government and business representatives on the Board, the Coalition was not successful in obtaining such funds. No other funds were forthcoming during the year it was funded by the Gannett Foundation. By the end of the project year (April 1989), the Alabama Public Library Service (the Coalition's sponsoring agency) had received a drastic funding cut of $2.9 million for 1988-89, making the future of the Literacy Coalition even more uncertain. A legislative bill (which included funding), based on the state literacy plan which had been developed by the Coalition, was sponsored by several legislators; unfortunately, the bill died before being considered.

With little adult literacy structure or activity in place at the creation of the Coalition, the initiative had been not been able to generate a sufficient institutional base from which to weather the fiscal storms facing the state. The state's funding freeze precluded the continuation of the project director. After the exhaustion of the Gannett Foundation funds, and at the time of the site visit, available staff within the Alabama Public Library Service were conducting some residual Coalition activities but only when they could squeeze them into ongoing agency efforts.

2. California

SRA Associates, a California-based consulting firm conducted many of the activities funded by the Gannett Foundation. Although the activities and products generated by SRA were generally positively regarded, a residual effect of the work being done "outside" of any institutionalized entity was that once the project dollars were expended, most efforts specifically associated with the project also ceased. Absent funds to continue their efforts, SRA Associates moved on to other issues. Nevertheless, California's literacy efforts are innovative and committed, although budget constraints at the state level combined with an enormous need for services continues to strain the ability of the state to meet needs.

3. Connecticut

In Connecticut, state and project representatives all agreed that adult literacy is a critical issue in the state and that attention to the problem is "at an all time high." Nevertheless, the most targeted group, urban blacks, were still not participating in programs in sufficient numbers. Further, a budget deficit approaching $1 billion for fiscal years 89-90 and 90-91 had emerged, making funding for literacy programs even more difficult. Even at the time of the Bonus grant application (which was awarded), Project LINC staff stated: "The public funding prospects for LINC are somewhat pessimistic, given the combined state and Bridgeport deficits. Until such time as other potential sources materialize, LINC is critically dependent upon continued funding by the Gannett Foundation." No such other sources emerged.

4. Massachusetts

At the time of the site visit, a former staff member described the Massachusetts Coalition for Adult Literacy (MCAL) as "in a transition phase." The MALC was one of the few projects that specifically included the need for future funding as a Coalition goal with targeted fundraising activities in the project's second year. Although approximately 20 proposals were developed and sent to foundations by the end of 1989, none were funded.

The former Chair of the Board indicated that there was still considerable interagency interest in a statewide coalition but that acquiring funds was difficult, particularly because of the state's austerity budget. While membership in the MALC had grown from approximately 300 to more than 500 (paying $10 annual dues), other fundraising efforts were not successful. In sum, additional funding and future activity for MCAL appears unlikely. (Recent communication indicated that MALC received $20,000 from the Boston Globe in 1990.)

5. New York

Since the staff associated with the Gannett Foundation grant activities were in essence State Education Department employees, at the time of the site visit there had been no efforts, subsequent to the exhaustion of project dollars, to raise money for additional activities. Rather, the Literacy Council had returned to full dependency upon the State Education Department. This situation had the advantage of relative staff stability, but the disadvantage of working within a large bureaucratic system, which itself had priorities other than adult literacy education.

6. Oregon

In its Year 1 proposal, the Oregon Literacy Connection (OLC) coalition stated that the Project Coordinator would work closely with the ABE Staff Development Specialist at Oregon State University, the State Director of Adult Basic Education, and Oregon Literacy, Inc., to ensure continuation of project activities beyond the grant period. Toward the end of the second year of the project, in planning for the project's future, staff identified and approached several foundations which had an interest in literacy issues, including the Kellogg Foundation, the Mott Foundation, the Exxon Foundation, the Hearst Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation, and the Burlington Northern Foundation.

In addition to these potential funding sources, staff expected Oregon State University and the Oregon State Department of Education to take over many of the functions which the Oregon Literacy Connection had been providing.

At the time of the site visit, the Project Coordinator was developing a resource book for tutors. Existing Gannett Foundation funding was sufficient for core chapters orienting the tutor to respecting adult learners, assessing cultural differences, and selecting basic teaching styles that match the learning styles of individuals. The remaining eight sections needed additional funding, which the authors (Geraldine Pearson and Virginia Patton) hoped to obtain from the Office of Community Colleges. There was a clear interest in expanding this approach, particularly in many rural areas of the state, where there was a need to improve the resources available to individual tutors.

According to staff, there appeared to be increased corporate interest in adult literacy. IBM had joined the statewide committee, and workplace literacy was expanding even in such nontraditional areas as the lumber industry. Corporations, including such major employers as the electric utility, were increasingly providing leave time for volunteer tutors. The state's Adult Education and Literacy Advisory Board, composed of 25 individuals drawn from a broad spectrum of public, private, and not-for-profit organizations, helped raise adult literacy as an important item on the agenda of both candidates for Governor.

Despite these developments, according to correspondence dated January 1991, "Oregon's Literacy Connection no longer exists in its original form." The correspondence further indicates that some of the functions of the OLC have been continued by the Adult Education and Literacy Advisory Board of the Department of Education.

7. Rhode Island

When the Gannett Foundation funds ran out, the Education Department did not continue the salary line for the Adult Education Instructor. The VISTA Volunteers continued to function as resource people, without using the teleconference component, and the equipment was "mothballed." Several months later funds were located to rehire the Instructor, and the initiative was revived for several more months. According to correspondence from the State Education Specialist, the system was in use until early July 1990. The Specialist, who has been a strong supporter of the teleconferencing strategy, had hoped to convince his supervisor that it had sufficient value to warrant continuation.

8. Tennessee

The Tennessee Literacy Coalition (TLC) project was able to accomplish some of its goals, particularly those related to information and referral, local coalition development, and public awareness activities; however, it was less successful in the use of mobile training teams and in the strategy for workplace pilot projects. Most important, fundraising efforts to maintain the Coalition efforts after the close of the Gannett Foundation grant were undertaken too late. As the project progressed, the Board's Fundraising Committee became non-functional. Although the Oversight Committee of the Board talked frequently about the need to focus on survival after the Gannett Foundation grant ran out, it did not do so. The project was to run out of money at the end of 1989.

At the time of the site visit, the existence of the Hotline and the Clearinghouse, both developed during the grant period, were in jeopardy for continuation. Both staff and Board members were seeking funds from businesses, direct mail approaches, grant proposals, and the State Department of Education. One solution being considered was to connect the activities of the TLC to the Education Department. Discussions were taking place between representatives of the two entities, but progress was slow and did not look particularly promising.

Updated information provided subsequently to the site visit confirmed that some work is still occurring through the efforts of a part-time staff person who manages the TLC office and handles the Hotline. This person supplies 10 hours a week paid by VISTA and 5 hours a week paid from membership fees.

9. Washington

Formed in 1984 as a statewide coalition, the Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy (WACAL) was a mature entity at the beginning of the Gannett Foundation Year 1 grant. Coalition members involved in developing the Literacy Challenge proposal were very aware of the need to continue the activities of the project beyond the Gannett Foundation funding period. The identified priority of "maximizing resources" reflected the understood obligation to find the methods and means to continue WACAL's activities as well as to fund and support literacy activities in general. Project staff planned to pursue both public and private means of continuing the project.

In Year 2, the Advocacy, Legislation and Community Relations Committee of WACAL drafted state-level adult literacy legislation seeking to further formalize the work of the Coalition and to obtain state support for developing a comprehensive multi-sector adult literacy plan. The bill was taken up by the Higher Education Committee in the House of Representatives, and a sponsorship of 15 representatives was obtained. The bill received full endorsement from the House, but did not get placed on the Senate calendar by the required deadline. At the time of the site visit, the Coalition was no longer pursuing this legislative strategy.

In its Final Report, WACAL reported that it was actively pursuing both public and private means for continuing priority projects and that it had decided to continue as an advisory body to the service provider network. As such, it was identifying appropriate agencies or organizations in its membership to carry out and/or manage any activities involving funds. In addition, the State Superintendent of Public Instruction's Office appointed WACAL to participate in developing the four-year state plan being drafted (as required under the federal Adult Basic Education Act).

By the time of the site visit, the Coalition, which had given considerable thought and discussion to becoming a 501(c)(3) non-for-profit organization, decided not to pursue this strategy as staff believed it would restrict their ability to lobby for more state funds for literacy.

As WACAL faced the end of the second year of funding from the Gannett Foundation, the situation looked very discouraging. No funds had been generated from the Legislature, and no additional support dollars could be counted on from the Governor's Office. Hence, Washington Literacy became the repository of what remained of the initiative—the materials and the products which were developed and the Hotline. Washington Literacy continues to provide some staff support to activities associated with the Coalition. The Coalition still exists with representation from many public and private agencies including state agencies, community colleges, labor, and literacy programs.

Summary

In sum, the nine projects briefly described above were not able to generate funds to continue their work, even though some of them (for example, Washington) were relatively well established. Reasons for their inability to continue were specific to each project, although scarcity of funds in general was a common theme in virtually every state. In each Gannett Foundation project there was the challenge to raise funds as well as to conduct adult literacy activities. This dual effort proved too difficult for many. (See Chapter 3 for more discussion of fundraising issues.)

CHAPTER FIVE

Recommendations

The magnitude of the Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge grant program was extraordinary, both in its "reach"—the systemic changes which it sought to make—and its "scope"—the sheer volume of efforts which took place as a result of the initiative. As reflected throughout this document, the Literacy Challenge resulted in a virtual explosion of adult literacy activities and the development of significant outcomes, including products and materials. It is clear that the Gannett Foundation goals to expand adult literacy systems throughout the country were substantially met during the lifetimes of the individual projects.

Nevertheless, it is important to realize that almost all of the projects were operating in state or regional fiscal environments which were sliding further into crisis. The difficulties in capturing resources and commitments on behalf of adult education were escalating virtually everywhere. The greatest challenge faced by staff and boards alike was to meet these difficulties. This reality is not likely to change in the foreseeable future; provider agencies face a long-term crisis. All sectors of the society, including government, private voluntary providers, and foundations, need to recognize the implications of this national condition and focus on ways to be most helpful in at least maintaining (if not expanding) service delivery systems.

The following recommendations are presented in recognition of the struggle for program delivery. They suggest strategies which might improve the probabilities for the long-term impact and survival of nonprofit organizations regardless of the program or service delivery system. These recommendations are particularly targeted to initiatives seeking complex systemic changes, as was the Literacy Challenge.

1. Foundations should consider making longer-term financial investments in projects, even if that means fewer projects can be funded. As discussed in Chapter Three of this report, nonprofit organizations need time to develop funding bases. In instances where new alliances, programs and services, and/or entities have been created, new sources of funding support have to be developed as well. In the case of most of the Gannett Foundation grantees, project staff were (understandably) so busy conducting adult literacy activities that they simply did not have time to allocate the amount of resources needed to increase the likelihood of activities continuing after the conclusion of the grant.
2. Foundations should consider specifically allocating a portion of initial grantee funds for development efforts when human service providers are expected to identify and develop alternative future sources of funding, as in the Literacy Challenge. Even when proposals include plans for development and suggest that part of the proposed budget be devoted to development,

provider agencies overwhelmed by demands for services will opt to provide those services. With such targeted allocation built into and considered during initial proposal development and initial grant award, fund development efforts could be more effectively conducted by individuals with such skills, rather than by individuals whose professional training and interests lie in providing direct services. We do not assume that resource developers can be executive directors; we should not assume that executive directors can be resource developers.

3. Foundations should consider making more direct technical assistance available to grantees in resource development, including the marketing of grantee materials and products. Transfer of information and strategies should be facilitated. Without such support, valuable products simply sit where they are developed and do not contribute to the wider development of knowledge and provider systems.
4. Foundations should consider increasing the use of site visits. Such visits can play a vital role both to the grantee in the form of technical assistance and to the funding source in terms of actually knowing what is occurring within a grant. Primary reliance upon information provided solely by a grantee frequently is not an adequate basis for monitoring and assessing grantee performance.
5. Foundations should consider what types of impact information is desired from grantees and indicate early in the grant period (preferably before it begins) that such information is required. Absent a clear directive, grantees are rarely inclined to focus their attention on such activities.

APPENDIX A

Project Goals and Objectives

The following list provides insight into the scope and range of the projects' aspirations as it includes all goals and objectives, even those which the projects were not able to achieve. The goals and objectives are presented in the formats used in the original projects' proposals. They range in number from modest (for example, Puerto Rico's 4) to very detailed (such as Nevada's 49). As is clear from a review of the list, goals, objectives, and activities were frequently blurred in the proposals.

Alabama

1. Provide a central office through which communication, using telephone calls, visits and/or letters, among literacy agencies could flow, as well as providing a greater resource pool from which to draw and receive information.
2. Distribute information on literacy activities, conferences, tutor training seminars, legislation dealing with literacy training, GED graduations, and businesses with employee training programs.
3. Bolster visibility of both literacy efforts and individual organizations' activities by distributing information to media. Such activities would also attract tutors and students, as well as help synchronize media campaigns with literacy providers' schedules and capabilities.
4. Maintain or establish contact with literacy advocate groups on a national level.
5. Assist the formation of new literacy task forces, with the goal of doubling the existing number of counties served by a task force from 6 to 12.
6. Support volunteer tutors through the ALC Tutor of the Month Program, components of which included a certificate and recognition in the monthly newsletter; and sending of a press release and article to the tutor's local newspaper, library and Chamber of Commerce.

Alaska

1. To provide regional Training of Trainers (TOT) workshops in Fairbanks, Anchorage, and Juneau; one workshop in each site, reaching an average of 10 trainers and focused on the content areas of Laubach Literacy Training; Literacy Volunteers of America; Parents and Tots Reading Program; Philosophy of Adult Education; Instructional Methodologies; and Recruitment and Retention.

2. To hire a part-time literacy coordinator to disseminate information, provide technical assistance, coordinate training, and distribute materials.
3. To recruit new volunteers (up to 150) and nonreaders (up to 450) into existing programs by enlarging the public awareness campaign initiated by PLUS, including the development of a statewide information brochure listing all available literacy services; design and production of at least two radio spots for use on local stations; development of theme posters; development and distribution of three videotapes, including "They Cannot Read: An Alaskan Look at Illiteracy"; and the continued use of the statewide 800 number for recruitment and referral.
4. To develop with the State Library Division a model delivery of the Parents and Tots Reading Program for literacy instruction; activities to include development of a model delivery; field test of the model delivery; development of a training kit; delivery of Parents and Tots Reading Program training at Training for Trainers workshops and at major Alaska education conferences; distribution of Parents and Tots Reading Program materials; and involvement of at least eight libraries in these activities.

Bonus Year

5. To develop a model workplace literacy program, and deliver two workshops (with an average of 10 attendees) to Alaska Commercial Company trainers who would in turn use their skills to train tutors in their stores.
6. To train trainers for Alaska's correctional facilities, through the delivery of a workshop to representatives from each of the state's correctional facilities.
7. To expand the use of the Parents and Tots Program, through a workshop directed toward interested librarians, follow-up information in a quarterly newsletter, and on-going available technical assistance.
8. To maintain technical assistance to active trainers, and to deliver one or more workshops to participants from previous workshops in order to refresh and increase their abilities.

California

1. Promote statewide communication among literacy programs by establishing the groundwork for locally based adult literacy information and referral services; to be accomplished by updating and disseminating the existing statewide inventory of adult literacy service providers, and by providing training to literacy providers on the use of the inventory.
2. Increase the number of referrals being made by training personnel from other state and community agencies; to be accomplished by training in the use of the inventory and in making referrals, provided to other agencies with extensive public contact with hard-to-reach, at-risk populations (such as the Employment Development Department and county welfare and probation offices).

Connecticut

1. Institutionalize the process of collaboration among literacy providers in Bridgeport for the improvement of recruitment, retention, and instruction of undereducated native speaking minority adults throughout the city.
2. Recruit at least 150 illiterate black adults through the Interdenominational Ministers Alliance (IMA), of which 135 would be retained.
3. To develop and execute a program model which would recruit, train, support, and assess at least 50 "literacy assistants" from the minority community (also through the IMA), 45 of whom would act as tutors and help with literacy instruction to minority students.

4. Develop and implement an assistant support network to give assistants ongoing training, links with community and educational resources, and a way to communicate among themselves.
5. Formulate and execute a systematic approach to diagnosing, instructing, and assessing literacy students.
6. Develop a strategic learner-centered plan for the collaborative delivery of adult literacy services in Bridgeport.
7. Analyze the Bridgeport activities in terms of replication in other communities.
8. Devise and execute an evaluation design for the programs which would provide on-going formative data for project refinement, and which would be able to be replicated as the project spread throughout Connecticut.

Bonus Year

9. Work with the IMA churches and other groups to make routine or "institutionalize" the recruitment activities and literacy support begun under LINC.
10. Provide information and technical assistance to other urban organizations which might benefit from the LINC model.
11. Explore every possibility for long-term funding for LINC.

Delaware

1. Establish and/or strengthen collaborative efforts in workplace literacy, intergenerational literacy, and volunteer initiatives; three new efforts between volunteer organizations and adult education programs, and three new efforts in workplace settings, to be established.
2. Development and field testing of a model program to reduce intergenerational illiteracy, serving 10-30 illiterate parents.
3. Add 25 new business and industries members to the Coalition.
4. Increase public awareness and promote understanding of and commitment to reducing adult illiteracy, with at least 450 persons informed through improvisational theater performances.
5. Establish an effective statewide information and referral system among public, private and government organizations, which sets clear program service areas and parameters for types of services available to students with particular interests and needs; at least 400 individuals will receive information.
6. Increase student participation by 10 percent (from 2,288 to 2,517), as a result of greater public awareness and more efficient provision of information about available programs.
7. Increase volunteer participation by 20 percent (from 400 to 500).
8. Increase student retention, resulting from improved information and referral and more appropriate placements, by 5 percent.
9. Increase volunteer retention, resulting from increased expertise in volunteer program management, by 10 percent.
10. Convene at least 30 literacy providers, business and industry representatives, and individuals from other interested organizations to disseminate and/or receive information and to plan future activities.

Illinois

1. To design and test strategies related to improving the resource development capabilities of public and private adult literacy programs in the state.
2. To clarify the roles of the six major literacy organizations with the aim of institutionalizing a statewide literacy network.
3. To establish four task forces to design and test strategies for developing local resources.
4. To establish a statewide task force to create statewide strategies for the support of the local initiatives.

Year 2

5. To provide technical assistance in the four task areas of resource development to all types of providers.
6. To continue to network and coordinate with related public and private literacy-related entities and associations.
7. To make recommendations on the institutionalization of the project as a resource development and communication center.

Indiana

1. To expand and enhance coordination and cooperation among providers of literacy services at the local level, especially through a process of local coalition building (to increase the number of coalitions from 28 to 35).
2. To increase the capacity of existing provider groups and local coalitions to serve low functioning level adults through volunteer literacy tutoring services (to increase the number of groups by 10; the number of tutors by 500; the number of learners by 500).
3. To help initiate new literacy instructional programs in unserved areas of the state (using regionally-based, trained volunteers and resource people).
4. To improve the accountability of the state's literacy initiative (through the development of an ongoing evaluation process, with both process and impact measures, and baseline data).
5. To expand efforts to make the general public and business and industry aware of the illiteracy problem and to enlist their support.

Year 2

6. To improve the accountability of local coalitions through a certification process.
7. To improve the effectiveness of literacy providers to provide services to specific populations.

Kentucky

1. Develop four regional technical assistance groups (TAGs) to serve as a permanent resource to community literacy groups, in their efforts to recruit and train volunteer tutors.
2. Publish and disseminate four model program descriptions (including community-based, school-based, community service-based, and library-based) to assist new community literacy groups in choosing an appropriate structure for their community.
3. Create three 30-minute video programs and accompanying print materials that would be a resource to tutors working with special needs students.
4. Create three 30-minute video programs and accompanying print materials that would offer community literacy groups training in fundraising, recruitment, and evaluation.

5. Conduct one regional tutor-trainer workshop in each of the 15 area development districts. Through this process, it was intended that 375 new tutor-trainers would be put in place.

Maine

1. Develop and convene the Maine State Literacy Coalition.
2. Provide training for literacy providers, including volunteers, business and industry and social service agencies on the chronic problems associated with illiteracy.
3. Sensitize staff and volunteers to the appropriate instructional techniques for working with illiterate adults.
4. Develop strategies for student recruitment.
5. Coordinate activities with the public libraries to encourage services and increase public awareness.
6. Encourage and assist the development of local literacy task forces.
7. Promote coordination of the major providers of literacy services in Maine.
8. Coordinate literacy awareness activities on a statewide basis.

Year 2

9. Develop a five-year plan for the Maine Literacy Coalition to continue to implement its mission statement.
10. Promote communication and full cooperation of the providers of literacy services in Maine.
11. Encourage business and labor to develop on-site literacy programs.
12. Assist in the coordination of student recruitment activities.
13. Increase awareness of adult literacy concerns.
14. Coordinate activities with the public libraries to encourage services and promote family literacy.
15. Promote the use of improvisational theater techniques in the promotion of awareness activities, teacher and tutor training opportunities, and student recruitment.

Massachusetts

1. Strengthen the coordination and dissemination of adult literacy information by providing statewide, coordinated and comprehensive adult literacy information and referral services: Establish and staff a toll-free Hotline and computerized database capable of handling a minimum of 3,000 callers per year; publish a directory and mid-year update of adult literacy and related services; and publish a bimonthly funding newsletter.
2. Expand the capacity within the state to effectively utilize more volunteer literacy tutors by assisting in the initial planning of the Commonwealth Literacy Corps (part of the Governor's Literacy Initiative to recruit, train, and place volunteer literacy tutors with adults, beginning July, 1987): Work with the Governor's Office to prepare an advisory and planning document with guidelines and strategies for developing a comprehensive volunteer program; provide continuing expertise and advice on the planning, implementation, and evaluation of the Governor's Commonwealth Literacy Corps.
3. Increase public and private resources available to adult literacy programs within the state: Assist in the development of three to six regional coalition networks; expand the Coalition's general membership; keep members of the Massachusetts Legislature, the Board of Education, the Board of Regents, the Board of Library Commissioners, the Governor's Office, and other significant state agencies involved

in literacy work informed of the activities of the Coalition, other literacy activities, issues, concerns and needs; increase the participation of business, trade, service, labor, and community leaders in the Coalition's public information and awareness network.

4. Increase public awareness of the adult illiteracy problem and how individuals, groups and communities can help alleviate the problem in their community: Develop six public service announcement and six news/feature spots for television and radio; develop print materials; plan a Massachusetts Literacy Day.

Year 2

5. Increase and broaden MCAL's base of future financial support: Develop membership campaign strategies and initiate MCAL's membership drive to include a minimum of 1,500 individual, family, programs, agency, and corporate members; establish an MCAL Fund Development Committee to develop a fundraising strategy and policy which would enable MCAL to seek to supplement memberships revenues while not competing with programs for funds; identify potential public and private funding resources; submit appropriate grant proposals or requests for support from identified resources; explore ways for various MCAL projects to become institutionalized or to be assumed by various MCAL organizational members.

Minnesota

1. Increase the number of adult learners, through radio and television PSAs; distribution of Hotline posters and tearpads to welfare offices, libraries, and social service agencies; distribution of student recruitment and Hotline information through a mailing of a statewide utility bill; and work with the Department of Education, Literacy Training Network, and the Minnesota Community Education Association in promoting the viewing of GED tapes on television.

   Associated additional activities in Year 2 include the expansion of the student recruitment pay check stuffers to three statewide mailings of unemployment checks and medical assistance payments; selecting and organizing 15 sites for the staging of a student recruitment play in non-theater settings; distribution of student recruitment posters and tear pads to 65 ABE consortiums and 40 volunteer tutor projects; the development of two radio PSAs specifically encouraging student recruitment; and the development of one poster and pay check stuffer to promote the viewing of GED-on-TV tapes so that 750 learners statewide can prepare for the GED tests through home viewing.

2. Increase the capacity to tutor functionally illiterate adults by increasing volunteer training activities, through the training of an additional 270 community volunteers by holding nine tutor training workshops; and by recruiting and registering five new apprentice tutor-trainers.

   Associated additional activities in Year 2 include the recruitment and registering of five new apprentice tutor-trainers; assistance to the current apprentice trainers through the process of certification; and the provision of timely technical assistance to trainers through the existing monthly newsletter and the toll-free numbers.

   Also, increase the tutor training options, through the dissemination of information on volunteer training systems and newly developed resources; increase communication about training modifications or new resources; and maintain the Laubach approach while increasing the appropriate use of LVA.

3. Increase the effectiveness of the statewide volunteer training system to respond to requests to serve functionally illiterate adults, through the provision of technical assistance to five new or emerging local literacy projects; the development and dissemination of a statewide information package on available volunteer training systems; review of systems available from national and regional literacy programs, addition of effective training packages and strategies to existing training systems, and dissemination of

information to local projects; increase in communication capabilities with local literacy projects statewide.

4. Increase the resources available for teaching the learning disabled functionally illiterate adult population, through the training of 45 new volunteers in three training sessions to increase knowledge of learning disabilities and multi-sensory phonics-based techniques; and the development of a training manual and teaching guide for trainers, teachers, and volunteer tutors for instructional use with learning disabled, functionally illiterate adult students.

   Associated additional activities in Year 2 include the training of 15 new volunteers as math tutors in the use of multi-sensory techniques; the development of a Teacher's Handbook for math instruction for use with learning disabled, functionally illiterate adult students; and the development and production of a videotape to supplement the Teacher's Handbook.

5. Increase knowledge about learning disabilities and provide technical assistance to teachers, trainers and volunteer tutors, through pilot testing the teaching guidebook with eight teacher/trainers from four ABE sites, with an intensive two-day training workshop and follow-up site consultations; presentation of the training manual and teaching guide at a statewide conference; and dissemination reports on the project via the statewide newsletter for ABE teachers.

6. Increase the capacity of literacy programs through the use of technology in instruction and management, such that 1,000 new students would have access to computer instruction; and 100 adult literacy teachers and 100 volunteer tutors would be trained in the appropriate uses of technology in literacy instruction.

   Associated additional activities in Year 2 include the development of four regional networks and the conduct of four regional workshops to expand on the initial training of teachers and volunteers in the application of technology in literacy instruction.

7. Increase literacy programs' abilities through awareness of and access to existent computer technology, through the development of cooperative networks and statewide collaboration for computer usage; and the identification of key technology resources not being used or underutilized.

8. Provide greater access to program information, and to promote public understanding of literacy programs and volunteer opportunities, through the provision of general information to 200 individuals by phone; and specific program referral to 1,000 potential learners and 400 potential volunteers by phone.

   Associated activities in Year 2 include the expansion of general information to an additional 200 individuals; and specific program referral to 2,000 potential learners and 300 potential volunteers by phone.

9. Increase the general public's awareness of the problems of the functionally illiterate adult and the programs which exist to teach basic skills, through the submission of project activities to provider groups' newsletters; presentations at least 25 meetings and conferences in the year; television and radio appearances; news releases to 25 daily newspapers; and the development and presentation of updated legislative recommendations.

Mississippi

1. To maximize the impact of the developing Mississippi Literacy Coalition.
2. To increase the number of students and volunteers, and to reduce dropouts in Mississippi.
3. To provide training and increase resources available for literacy activities.

4. To organize a state literacy conference.
5. Installation and promotion of the 24-hour literacy toll-free hotline will result in an average of 20 calls per week, 80 calls per month, and 960 calls for the first year of the grant.
6. The number of students enrolled in literacy programs will be increased by 1,500 and the number of tutors by 1,500.
7. Since the dropout rate at the level just below the fourth grade has been a serious problem, the development of the new tutor intervention model, as well as other features of this programs, will reduce the dropout rate by 30 percent and will increase the student reading level by one year compared with past student performance evaluations.
8. Current students and tutors will increase the length of time they participate in a literacy program by 50 percent compared with past performance.
9. Local literacy organizations will increase the number of students and tutors by 100 percent compared with the previous year.

Nevada

1. Strengthen the Nevada Literacy Coalition.
2. Open a Nevada Literacy Office in the Nevada State Library and Archives in Carson City, Nevada; staff the office with a full-time Director/Trainer and two part-time assistants.
3. Coordinate statewide literacy activities and increase communications among all agencies and groups involved in programs; expand the Northern Nevada hotline into a single statewide literacy information and referral hotline, advertised as the primary source of literacy information in Nevada.
4. Collect information and statistics on literacy programs in Nevada by completing a statewide needs assessment to show where intensive literacy efforts are indicated; develop a system of accountability for gathering information and disseminating it to key individuals and groups.
5. Develop a Literacy Advisory Board to oversee the project, handle legal matters, monitor expenditures, and promote funding of literacy efforts.
6. Create targeted publicity to increase awareness of literacy programs and problems.
7. Develop public service announcements for TV, radio, and newspapers.
8. Provide inserts for government welfare and unemployment checks and maintain information receptacles at public offices such as utilities, employment security offices, and the Department of Motor Vehicles.
9. Produce a Directory of Nevada Literacy Programs including locations, names of contacts, phone numbers, and complete descriptions of individual literacy activities across the state.
10. Create targeted outreach programs to prevent illiteracy among future Nevadans, such as parents of children in Head Start and new parents using the services of hospital maternity wards.
11. Provide training and increase resources for statewide literacy programs.
12. Conduct at least 12 programs per year in locations across Nevada where sufficient interest in literacy activity exists; provide training in both urban areas which are dependent upon volunteer trainers and in rural areas where little training is currently available.
13. Sponsor an intensive two-day training institute for teachers and volunteer trainers.

14. Increase tutoring and program resources available to all literacy participants; tutoring materials and information packets will be provided to volunteers and students involved in literacy programs; resource guides will be provided and a bibliography of recommended materials for discrete reading levels will be developed through collaboration with literacy workers, the university system, and librarians.

15. Spread the training network to rural areas by providing capacity building sessions and consulting services specific to the needs of new programs.

16. Establish a statewide literacy agenda.

17. Sponsor a Statewide Literacy Conference, to be attended by Nevadans involved in all types of literacy activities, providing opportunities for continuing education and a forum for sharing opportunities for continuing education and a forum for sharing information.

Year 2

18. Establish and secure statewide literacy coordination.

19. Analyze input on the Coalition three-year plan gained at the statewide literacy conference. Use this analysis along with UNR Needs Assessment as planning tools. Coordinate the three-year plan task force committee under leadership of Coalition Advisory Board members from the public and private sector. Ensure participation of a member of the American Bar Association in this planning process.

20. Develop an entity and mechanism for receiving, monitoring, and expending of funds received from private sector individuals and organizations.

21. Assist the Reading Center of Northern Nevada in developing a secure funding base. Continue management of the statewide toll-free literacy line through the Reading Center. Collect statistics on use of the literacy line.

22. Continue VISTA Literacy Volunteers to support three literacy volunteer programs.

23. Develop a strategic plan for business and industry literacy support.

24. Authorize Advisory Board member from IBM to chair the Business and Industry Literacy Program Plan committee and develop a master plan for the business community.

25. Coordinate literacy awareness events for business and industry in northern and southern Nevada via the Private Industry Council, Western Industrial Nevada, and Governor's recognition business luncheons.

26. Explore the partnership of business/industry, Department of Education, and JTPA in funding technological literacy programs in the community and the state prisons in funding technological literacy programs in the community and the state prison system.

27. Evaluate the supply/demand balance for literacy services.

28. Monitor literacy programs' goals and activities affecting supply of tutors, training activities, and recruitment of students.

29. Delegate to the Coalition Publicity Task Force and PLUS Task Force the monitoring of responsible publicity sensitive to the needs of literacy programs in supplying tutoring services.

30. Assist literacy programs in developing effective student recruitment techniques.

31. Explore additional tutor candidates: prison inmates; members of the Silver State Reading Association; Retired Teachers Association; male tutors, recruited from male oriented service organizations and male-dominated industries; and handicapped populations, e.g., disabled veterans.

32. Introduce tutor training methods that increase learning and decrease long-range time commitments of tutors and students, provide models for small group tutoring of literacy students and transitions from intensive one-on-one tutoring to small group or classroom settings, and provide quality certification for tutor trainers in a time efficient manner.
33. Provide in-depth program development consultation to new and existing literacy programs.
34. Coordinate consultation activities with the Nevada Office of Volunteerism introducing program management methods from the volunteer sector.
35. Expand the operating base of Laubach Council based literacy programs by introducing training techniques as described above. Develop this activity in line with Laubach International goals including community-based organization models.
36. Encourage ongoing in-service education programs for tutors using the Resource Guide of teachers and trainers developed in the first year project goals as a networking tool; also, develop other educational resources via organizations such as the Silver State Reading Association and Retired Teachers Association.
37. Develop a Coalition-based lending library of videotape and cassette tape educational programs for use in all literacy programs and especially rural programs which have less access to a pool of local resource people.
38. Continue the publication of a Coalition newsletter as a communication and training tool.
39. Coordinate program planning in state prisons.
40. Hold planning meetings with appropriate state and private organizations concerned with carrying out the legislative mandate for literacy activity in prisons.
41. Plan and implement literacy awareness programs for prison management and staff.
42. Explore funding sources for providing tutor training, tutor and student materials, secure facilities for tutoring and storage of materials and equipment.

Year 3

43. Design, write, and produce 300 copies of Volunteer Development: Strengthening Your Literacy Program, a "how to" manual, by September 1989.
44. Provide training sessions on use of the manual to a minimum of three literacy coalitions, four local literacy programs, five libraries, and statewide or national conferences by January 1990.
45. Print 300 copies of Stories and More for distribution to Nevada literacy programs, libraries serving literacy programs, community college adult education programs, prison and honor camp literacy and ABE programs, and Literacy Challenge grantees nationwide by October 1989.
46. Extend coalition development by coordinating project activities on a continual basis with the Governor's Literacy Advisory Council, the Governor's Job Training Office, state agencies relating to literacy needs of Nevadans, Voluntary Action Centers, workplace literacy partners, Department of Education, and other key organizations supporting adult literacy efforts in Nevada.
47. Evaluate coalition development by assessing the number of organizations and participants in project training and consultation activities, the increase in coordination and implementation of literacy activities among community agencies, and the development of coalition activity plans by the Governor's Literacy Advisory Committee.

48. Evaluate the recruitment and retention of literacy volunteers and adult learners by phone interview surveys, comparative records of length of volunteer service, and student retention in a minimum of four volunteer literacy programs by February 1990.
49. Evaluate, at the beginning of the last month in the grant year, literacy program coordinators' skills in volunteer management by assessing the number of concepts applied as gained via the manual, training sessions, and individual consultations; by policies developed or refined, by volunteer contracts and job descriptions developed and or refined, and by other program and coalition development activities identified as related to the project's purpose and goals.

New Mexico

1. Develop four demonstration projects in four distinct prototype communities.
2. Organize a statewide conference, to assist local programs in sustaining adequate resources for long-term literacy efforts.
3. Operate a literacy hotline.
4. Develop a statewide resource directory.

   Bonus Year

5. To retain staff and office space, ensuring continued grant administration of ongoing projects, dependable and expert consulting services, and resource development for local program support.
6. To expand grant opportunities to local literacy programs, from approximately $68,000 in the 1988-89 fiscal year to double that amount with special emphasis on start-up projects and technology enhancements for existing programs.
7. To create a state literacy resource center, housing the Coalition's adult basic education and literacy education books and software, and a planned circulation collection of training and public awareness videos; equipped with TV/VCR computers and work tables; and available to literacy workers and advocates.
8. To expand (if the request from the State Legislature were appropriated to the NMCL, thereby freeing up some of the Gannett Foundation monies) activities associated with a) Litlink, leading to the eventual connection of all of the literacy programs via an electronic bulletin board; b) installation of conference room and Resource Center telephones; and c) the creation of the New Mexico Coalition for Literacy Committee Project fund to encourage innovative grassroots projects to emanate from the Board membership.

New York

1. Convene 11 teacher/tutor and learner caucuses, reflective of the 11 task forces established around the state in response to the Project Literacy U.S. campaign launched in September 1986.
2. Convene one statewide literacy convention, giving both practitioners and learners from the diverse literacy programs around the state a forum to meet and articulate their concerns and needs.
3. Sponsor a competition for mini-grants to support regional activities to implement recommendations resultant from the regional caucuses and the convention, and to support student workshop presentations at a State Education Department conference.
4. Develop and distribute a booklet describing the student workshop presentations.

Oregon

1. Improve statewide literacy coordination: convene Oregon's Literacy Connection Task Force; hire Project Coordinator; develop coordination with existing literacy service groups; and coordinate provision of literacy services. Added in Year 2: disseminate information about existing services by publishing a booklet of information to all identified literacy providers; plan for continuation of project services existing groups and coordinate provision of literacy services.
2. Expand multiple-agency efforts: identify underserved areas and target groups; recruit new groups; provide training to local program personnel; and provide placement and follow-up services to learners and volunteer tutors. Added in Year 2: local volunteer managers will designate a person at each site to act as "Tutor Trainer"; the Project Coordinator will provide training for the designated tutor trainers during the annual conference, using the Tutor Training Guide; provide follow-up services to learners and volunteer tutors.
3. Expand Department of Education technical assistance efforts: develop tutor training kit; distribute tutor training kit; develop learner assessment and instructional strategies services; implement assessment and instructional strategies; implement database of instructional strategies; establish statewide clearinghouse of tutor training resources. Added in Year 2: develop assessment and instructional strategies services; evaluate assessment tools for adult disabled readers; develop an instrument to establish a learner profile for diagnostic and prescriptive services for adult disabled readers; field test assessment instrument; implement instructional strategies; implement collection and storage system for instructional strategies.
4. Evaluate learner progress in volunteer literacy tutor programs: plan and design evaluation process and instruments; implement program evaluation. Added in Year 2: monitor learner attrition in three sample programs; write a report to help programs continue their own evaluations.
5. Evaluate the effectiveness of Oregon's Literacy Connection project: establish formative evaluation design; conduct formative evaluation. Added in Year 2: complete a formative evaluation; conduct a summative evaluation.

Pennsylvania

1. Serve more functionally illiterate adults by generating greater public awareness of the problem and increasing the resources of direct service providers through coalition building at both the state and local levels.
2. Establish a statewide Pennsylvania State Coalition for Adult Literacy to provide a state leadership presence for the purpose of advocacy in support of local literacy efforts.
3. Conduct a statewide needs assessment to determine priorities needing support from the State Coalition; facilitate the conducting of local needs assessments in existing local coalitions.
4. Strengthen existing local coalitions and establish at least six new local coalitions in areas of greatest need based on needs assessment results to facilitate the improvement of literacy services through partnership endeavors between the public and private sectors.
5. Form an Advocacy Committee of the State Coalition to act as a state-level advocate in assisting local literacy programs to develop autonomy in their financial support.
6. Strengthen statewide adult literacy efforts through coordinated technical assistance to direct service providers via coalitions, as follows.

7. Establish at the Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy of the Pennsylvania State University a computerized resource bank of qualified persons available to provide outreach support and training to those agencies needing services.
8. Convene at least three regional workshops to enable local groups to design strategies for more effective utilization of local resources for fund development potential and of involvement with the private sector in adult literacy endeavors.
9. Develop a technical assistance packet of materials as a source of ongoing help and support as a follow-up to the regional workshops.
10. Form a Local Coalition Support Committee of the State Coalition to initiate local coalition building and ensure monies for adult literacy programming are channeled through local coalitions for the mutually planned project.
11. Establish through appropriate, existing newsletters a communications network among service providers to disseminate information on effective instructional programs, curriculum and materials, and teaching techniques and methods.
12. Set up a communications network among service providers to disseminate the information on available funding sources for adult literacy programming.
13. Through local coalitions inform the general public of literacy needs and opportunities in areas of greatest need based on needs assessment results.
14. Develop a proposal from the State Coalition to the Ben Franklin Partnership Act of Pennsylvania using Gannett Foundation funds plus donations from the private sector as matching monies.

Puerto Rico

1. Offer reading instruction to 600 illiterate youth and adults in Arecibo (a coastal district), with reading skills equivalent to two levels of enhancement from the initial level at time of enrollment.
2. Recruit and train one Project Director, two counselors, seven full-time academic itinerant-teachers, three part-time teachers, and 15 school directors.
3. Recruit and train 65 volunteers.
4. Demonstrate the transferability of the model, while testing improvements to it.

Year 2

5. Provide educational services to 600 illiterates in the Caguas region, with essentially the same resources and activities as in Year 1.

Rhode Island

1. To strengthen adult literacy efforts within the state of Rhode Island by piloting a model which will increase the network of service providers in literacy training.
2. To increase substantially the number of adults receiving job-related literacy training at their work site.
3. To increase substantially the number of single parent heads-of-household and limited-English-proficient adults receiving literacy training at a convenient and non-threatening site in public housing.
4. To pilot successfully the use of tele-instruction as an additional means of providing literacy instruction to hard-to-reach populations.
5. To develop materials for tele-instruction for industry-based and public housing based clients.

6. To provide tele-instructional classes and support tutoring for two industry and labor-based and two public housing-based groups of clients, with each group having 8 to 10 students each (totaling 320 students.)
7. To provide a connection to career guidance and technical training programs for students.
8. To develop a means of disseminating this programs to additional industry-based sites, AFL-CIO sites, and public housing in other towns and cities throughout the state in Year 2.

Year 2

9. To retain existing circles and create a second group of new learning circles in 8 public housing projects in Providence.
10. To integrate and pilot the use of learning materials produced by USA TODAY especially "Careers" and "Decision 88."
11. To create new learning circles at eight industrial locations.
12. To create an instructional network reaching persons on public welfare which will consist of at least four separate sites.
13. To pilot the expansion of the public housing network to include at least two locations outside Providence.
14. To pilot train volunteer tutors.
15. To facilitate/provide child care as needed.
16. To investigate/plan for the integration of electronic blackboards/or video into the system.
17. To recruit and train four new site facilitators.

Tennessee

1. Fund Raising: identify and seek public and private sources, e.g., secure publications on fund raising.
2. Communications: develop resources for public awareness, e.g., develop a theme, slogan and/or logo.
3. Long-Range Planning: use the current year's activities and accomplishments for the historical perspective, e.g., conduct a statewide, by county, survey of literacy needs.
4. Local Development and Training: provide training through the state's three geographic regions to establish and expand programs, e.g., identify providers and existing resources.
5. Program Support: provide support to new and ongoing information needs, e.g., work with the clearinghouse to assist in gathering information for the directory of literacy programs and other resources.
6. Clearinghouse: establish and maintain, e.g., acquire PC hardware and software.
7. Legislative Support: seek to stabilize a baseline effort, e.g., educate legislators in the need for their ongoing and growing support of adult literacy efforts.
8. Conduct "train-the-trainers" sessions and provide subsequent support services for the mobile training teams.
9. Create mobile training teams in the three major divisions of the state to deliver quality training to local program coordinators and prospective trainers.
10. Support the creation of new (and straighten existing) local literacy coalitions.

11. Support local literacy coalitions in developing clearinghouse functions and public awareness campaigns.
12. Conduct three regional conferences for literacy program coordinators and volunteer tutors.
13. Encourage ongoing networking among and between local literacy coalitions and programs.
14. Survey literacy service providers to determine the current status of services, and maintain directory information for networking and referral proposes.
15. Identify and make available to appropriate entities comprehensive literacy program implementation guides.
16. Plan, produce, and distribute at least one public service announcement suitable for broad-based use.
17. Plan, produce, and make available at least one literacy brochure/pamphlet for use by local literacy programs.
18. Plan, produce, and make available at least one literacy poster suitable for use by local literacy programs.
19. Work with the general media to publicize literacy needs and resources.
20. Establish and maintain regular communication with literacy clearinghouses and networks in other states.
21. Track and communicate relevant literacy information concerning emerging trends, issues and potential resources on the national, state and local level.
22. Staff the Hotline, to be used for information and referral on tutors, students, and local programs across the state.
23. Develop a 15-25-minute videotape to be used to increase public awareness and support.
24. Conduct conferences targeted to advanced training for existing literacy coordinators and local support group leaders, and to strengthening community support for local literacy programs.

Washington

1. Support and strengthen the existing Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy.
2. Increase the number of people served, and the quality of services provided.
3. Expand participation and support of all segments of society in the literacy challenge.
4. Provide staffing support to WACAL.
5. Continue operation of the toll-free Literacy Hotline.
6. Acquire staffing to provide management assistance and support to literacy programs in communities statewide.
7. Develop a demonstration project involving private business in the creation and implementation of literacy services.
8. Facilitate effective delivery of literacy efforts across the state through expansion and solidification of the existing Coalition by April 1988.
9. Facilitate recruitment and referral of 1,500 potential students to appropriate adult literacy services by April 1988.
10. Facilitate recruitment and referral of 1,500 potential volunteers to support literacy efforts by April 1988.

11. To involve at least one private business in development and implementation of literacy services by April 1988.
12. To assist a minimum of 10 local literacy service providers in improving services and developing a focus to consider the whole student in relation to literacy needs by April 1988.

Year 2

13. Enhance the visibility and effectiveness of the Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy.
14. Increase the number of people served and the quality of services provided, with an emphasis on the prospective student.
15. Expand the participation and support of all segments of society in the literacy challenge.
16. Continue to provide staffing support to WACAL with more of an issues focus.
17. Continue operation of the toll-free Literacy Hotline, including outreach, referral, and follow-up services.
18. Foster the involvement of business and existing literacy programs in developing workforce literacy programs.
19. Increase awareness of the need to support literacy programs statewide.
20. Identify and implement effective strategies with which to address statewide adult literacy issues.
21. Strengthen and maintain the existing statewide information and referral system for potential students and volunteers, and to improve the student referral system follow up program.
22. Provide a liaison between the business community and existing literacy service providers, facilitating the development of workforce literacy programs.
23. Provide leadership in educating both the public and private sectors of the need for increased resources in literacy programs statewide.

APPENDIX B

Reported Activities and Results

As stated in the Executive Summary, much of the project-related information in this Report, as well as that in the Individual Project Reports, derived from Literacy Challenge grant project staff themselves in interviews, correspondence, and/or various project materials. It was not the intention, nor was it within the resources, of this assessment to seek independent verification of figures or findings reported to the Gannett Foundation. If discrepancies emerged during review of the materials or during the site visit, they were noted in the individual reports and are referenced here. When "hard" data are available, they are reported; the reader will note, however, that specific details (for example, number of learners in attendance, number of times the technology was transferred and to whom, and impact of technical assistance activities) are frequently missing. This reflects the fact that many of the projects were not so diligent in their record keeping and reporting as the Gannett Foundation had hoped.

Information included here as "results" is not all-inclusive: many amorphous activities (for example, "networking," attendance at meetings, presentations of project activities, conversations with interested parties, and day-to-day local coalition building activities) were conducted within most of the Literacy Challenge projects but were not fully reported or documented. Listed below are those relatively "significant" activities which emerged from a review of project materials and discussions with project staff. Hence, although not exhaustive, the information detailed below generally indicates the overall scope and level of activities engaged in by the individual projects. It will become clear from reviewing the lists that some of the projects reported a great deal of activity but little in the way of concrete numbers associated with those activities, while others concentrated on reporting specific activities with specific numbers associated with their efforts.

Activities listed below are not prioritized by importance to the project; some of the listed items are "products" (e.g., final reports, directories, evaluation studies) and are also listed in the state-by-state Products List published in connection with this assessment. All important and/or unusual activities conducted by the projects are presented in more detail in Chapter 2, Significant Activities.

Alabama

1. Alabama Literacy Programs Directory, developed and disseminated to 1,200
2. Newsletter, Literacy Connection, distributed monthly, with growth in outreach, from 350 to 1,100
3. Volunteer tutors increased from 100 to 300
4. Formation of 15 new local coalitions or task forces
5. Distribution of 3,700 public awareness/student recruitment brochures
6. Public Service Announcements (10, 20, and 30 seconds)

7. Two statewide conferences—97 and 120 attendees
8. Two rural workshops—75 attendees
9. Policy paper on literacy for the Governor's Office
10. Development of a proposal for a Literacy Plan for the State of Alabama

Alaska

1. Three Training of Trainers (TOT) workshops, featuring a three-day program, conducted in Juneau, Fairbanks, and Anchorage; delivered to 12, 13, and 14 adult educators, respectively
2. 125 students served by the TOT workshop attendees
3. Additional TOT workshops, presented to 39 individuals
4. TOT delivered to a correctional facility
5. Two additional TOTs in previously unserved geographic areas
6. Materials and/or information routinely provided to about 50 tutors, and about 100 on an incidental basis
7. Information and materials provided to new tutors in four Alaska regions
8. Increased use of the hotline, logging 333 calls from July through December 1988, eventually averaging 40-45 calls during the winter months
9. Distribution of two issues of Alaska's Literacy Challenge Newsletter, FOCUS
10. Information brochure designed and distributed
11. Two PSAs, "They Cannot Read: An Alaskan Look at Illiteracy" and one featuring Alaska's First Lady, Michael Cowper, and a group of 10 adult new readers
12. Statewide poster contest and Susan Butcher recruitment poster
13. Legislative teleconference demonstration
14. Eight new TOT workshops including three in correctional facilities and four with librarians attending, all provided in locations with active literacy programs
15. 134 tutors served by these eight workshops
16. Eight additional workshops requested by the Coalition's Steering Committee, providing follow-up training to 18 trainers and training to 61 tutors
17. First Alaska Student Literacy Congress
18. 1990 Directory of Programs and Services developed and distributed
19. Parents and Tots Reading Program materials distributed
20. Reprints of culturally sensitive materials developed by the Adult Literacy Laboratory

California

1. Literacy Service Provider Database System
2. Directory of Adult Literacy Services in California: 1988-1989, Northern and Central California, 1,000 copies distributed
3. Southern California Literacy Referral Directory: 1988-1989, 1,000 copies distributed
4. Eight regional workshops
5. Training of approximately 718 adult school, community college, local literacy agencies, library personnel, and other potential referral agencies at the 16 provider and provider/referrer workshops
6. Two pilot workshops: a) sponsored by Social Advocates for Youth, a United Way funded agency, for youth counselors in a summer job training program; b) sponsored by the San Diego AIDS Network, for individuals working with AIDS patients and those at risk of contracting AIDS
7. Improving Interagency Coordination and Referral, Final Report by SRA Associates

Connecticut

1. Participation by 22 of 6 IMA churches
2. 65 liaisons trained and participated (none dropped out)
3. 59 volunteers trained as tutors (Literacy Assistants) (15% eventually dropped out)
4. 378 referrals made to the LINC office, all of whom were referred, including 114 who were enrolled in Project LINC classes (25% eventually dropped out)

Delaware

1. Workplace Literacy Conference ("Building a Quality Workforce"), with 125 attendees from the business community and adult literacy students and in-school, at-risk students
2. Information and Referral Conference, with 27 participants, from 23 organizations and agencies
3. Uniform hotline student referral guidelines
4. 141 hotline referrals
5. Distribution of 200 revised Directories of Adult Services
6. Volunteer Initiative Conference ("Developing Collaborative Efforts with Volunteers"), with representatives from eight organizations and agencies
7. Increase in volunteer hours from 14,517 in FY 1987 to 31,494 in FY 1988
8. Project BOND (intergenerational literacy) curriculum

Illinois

1. Newsletter, Resource Development News
2. Surveys sent by the Increasing Individual Donations Task Force
3. Four regional workshops in each of the four task force areas
4. 10-page article on family literacy projects in Illinois
5. Task Force Manual: Marketing Contractual Literacy Services to Business
6. Task Force Manual: Increasing Individual Donations
7. Task Force Manual: Increasing Corporate/Foundation Support
8. Task Force Manual: Impacting Local Public Policy
9. 2,174 manuals printed and distributed to Illinois providers
10. 14 manuals sold nationally
11. "Literacy awareness" luncheon for corporations and foundations
12. Panel discussion on Illiteracy and Poverty: Employment
13. Panel discussion on Illiteracy and Poverty: The Family
14. Workshops on linkages, lobbying, and proposal writing
15. Statewide survey of literacy services to businesses
16. 15 workshops and presentations on workplace literacy
17. Co-sponsorship of the first Chicago Labor Conference for Worker Education
18. Total of 48 workshops and/or presentations to more than 3,000 persons representing 882 organizations
19. More than $300,000 accessed by providers who relied upon the Coalition for technical assistance
20. 5,000 volunteer hours given
21. Videotape on monies available to Hispanic literacy programs

Indiana

1. Local Coalition/VISTA Orientation Workshop, 50 attending, representing 25 communities
2. Nine local and regional workshops
3. Increase in local literacy coalitions from 28 to 46
4. Increase in groups providing a voluntary literacy tutoring component from 46 to 88
5. Increase in total number of volunteer tutors from 1678 to 2743

6. Increase in ABE learners from 25,000 to 30,174
7. Increase in learners tutored in volunteer programs from 909 to 3,650
8. Increase in 60 topics on the Resource Cadre from 60 to 90
9. Increase in 30 individuals on the Resource Cadre from 30 to 213
10. Resource Cadre entered onto the Literacy Clearinghouse computer, showing 68 direct contacts, 39 referrals to groups, and 29 referrals to the Cadre during January 1-March, 1989
11. VISTA Volunteers working in seven of the eight Indiana regions in first year
12. VISTA Volunteers working in six regions in second year
13. 30 Literacy Improvisational Theater performances
14. 1,533 posters, 13,500 bookmarks, 2,650 bumper stickers
15. 31 billboards
16. Workshop packets
17. Unified, statewide promotional package with a theme, logo, and media spots
18. Three radio PSAs for nonreaders
19. Three radio PSAs for volunteer recruitment
20. 15- and 30-second television PSAs
21. Eight-foot wide, freestanding display unit to publicize adult literacy at public events
22. Conference on Literacy Instruction, in November, 1988, with 290 literacy providers, instructors, administrators, staff, and volunteers in attendance
23. The first Adult Literacy Student Congress, held at the Conference on Literacy Instruction
24. Recommendations by the Instructional Leadership Task Force
25. An Evaluation of Adult Literacy Efforts in Indiana
26. Indiana Literacy Month Handbook
27. Indiana Adult Literacy Clearinghouse Survey: Resource Cadre Questionnaire

Kentucky

1. 15 regional tutor-trainer workshops in each area district, with a total of 312 participants
2. Approximately 500 new tutor-trainers
3. Three 30-minute video series, "Making Literacy Work," and associated print materials on fundraising, recruitment and evaluation
4. Three 30-minute video series, "Teach An Adult To Read," and associated print materials on English as a Second Language, learning disabilities, and math skills
5. Four regional technical assistance groups (TAGs)
6. Tutor-Training Resource Manual, with 500 distributed

Maine

1. Increase in number of students from 8,000 (1986) to 13,500 (1990)
2. Increase in hotline calls from 150 per month to 500 per month
3. Bangor Daily News printing of 12-week GED review
4. Four issues of the newsletter
5. Maine Literacy Awareness Theater
    - Performances seen by approximately 2,000 people each year
    - Three regional theater groups trained to perform skits
    - 20 skits at selected site
    - Three facilitators to work with the regional theater groups
6. Conduct of trainer workshop using whole language approach
7. 10 tutor trainings, with average attendance of 12-15
8. 15 Business Breakfasts with more than 75 businesses

9. Manual for local providers speaking to other groups
10. On-site literacy programs adopted by 20 businesses
11. Two handbooks for use by literacy provider to promote on-site literacy programs
12. Development of four work-site Literacy-GED programs
13. PSA on business and literacy
14. "Read-a-thon" seminars
15. Literacy Initiative Tea held at the Governor's residence, Blaine House, with more than 140 people attending
16. First Maine Reading Marathon, with 60 readers in 12 hours, and more than 15 participating Maine authors as readers
17. 12-month student recruitment calendar
18. Student Recruitment Handbook for Literacy Providers, 300 copies distributed
19. Adult Literacy Handbook for Libraries and Librarians
20. Workforce Literacy Handbook
21. Media...Spreading the Word
22. New Reader Collections added to 30 libraries
23. Literacy consultation services to 10 libraries

Massachusetts

1. MCAL brochure printed and widely disseminated
2. Newsletter, MCAL News
3. 1989 membership drive
4. Increase of Coalition membership from approximately 300 programs and individuals to more than 500 dues ($10) members
5. Hotline established and referral process established
6. 1,817 calls between January and March 1989
7. Database of public and private adult literacy programs established
8. Directory of programs and services
9. Seven-page membership newsletter
10. 30-second PSA
11. Six news/feature spots for television and radio
12. Legislative Briefing Day
13. Print materials
14. "Meet and Greet" campaign with local providers and legislators
15. Legislative Press Conference
16. "Tax Teach-In"
17. Business Breakfast with 225 key business and labor leaders
18. Business and Labor Breakfasts co-sponsored with PLUS Task Force
19. Comprehensive Volunteer Program guidelines and strategies

Minnesota

1. Hotline calls of approximately 6,000
2. GED-on-TV promotional campaign
3. 30-second TV spot
4. Statewide literacy newsletter routinely distributed to approximately 3,000
5. 30- and 60-second general awareness radio PSAs
6. Print informational material
7. Statewide student recruitment campaign

8. Posters, advertising artwork, 165,0000 check stuffers
9. Training to more than 200 literacy providers
10. 443 teachers and literacy volunteers trained
11. 118 LVA-trained volunteers
12. Step-by-Step Curriculum Guides disseminated to 76 providers within Minnesota and 55 providers in other states, Learning Disabilities Association
13. 120 TLC trained teachers, eventually reaching approximately 561 students
14. The Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign: Evaluation Report.

Mississippi

1. Three 30-second videotape spots produced, directing listeners to the hotline (received the Jim Duffy Award)
2. Hotline, the Learning Line, established with Coalition Committee "Recommended Procedures"
3. Statewide Conference, "Building the Future: Mississippi's Challenge of Adult Literacy," held in November 1988
4. Print materials, including government welfare and unemployment check inserts, information receptacles in public offices, posters, flyers, newspaper articles, and hotline number on grocery bags
5. Directory of Mississippi Literacy Programs, developed in cooperation with the Governor's Office of Policy and Planning, disseminated at the November 1988 Statewide Conference and updated in November 1989 for the Mississippi Literacy Foundation
6. Tutor Intervention Model Program, designed to reduce student dropout, pilot-tested in three sites
7. Handbook for Tutor Intervention Model Program
8. Evaluation Report on the Tutor Intervention Model Program
9. Five regional, one-day workshops, serving 256 people
10. Establishment of the Mississippi Literacy Foundation

Nevada

1. Statewide Literacy Needs Assessment
2. Development of three regional coalitions covering the state and reflective of the unique geography and population distribution of Nevada
3. Convening of 165 participants at the first Statewide Literacy Conference, entitled "Link to Literacy-Link to Life," representing tutors, trainers, teachers, private business/state department representatives, and new adult learners; held in February 1988 in Las Vegas
4. Action plans for a) inclusion of the Coalition in the Nevada State Library's 1989 budget and the Governor's executive order and literacy advisory council; b) development of a Foundation for Literacy in Nevada
5. Production of products and training for tutors and program coordinators, a significant portion accomplished in conjunction with the Nevada Office of Volunteerism
6. Securing of five grants: a) Library Literacy Title VI (three grants over two years); b) Governor's Job Training Office; and c) ACTION-VISTA Literacy Volunteer (expanded from 3 to 5 positions in 1987-88, and to 10 positions in 1989-90)
7. Production of major publicity PSAs for radio and TV and print materials for newspapers, statewide
8. Consultation and training for seven rural communities
9. VISTA grant allowing the project to place 5 VISTA Volunteers in local programs in Year 1, five Volunteers in Year 2, and 19 Volunteers in Year 3
10. Regional workshop tours, in concert with the Nevada Office of Volunteerism
11. Securing of county funding for the Reading Center of Northern Nevada, which operates the statewide hotline

12. Creation of the Nevada Literacy Foundation
13. Technical assistance enabling the development of 25 new literacy programs statewide and 2 new coalitions
14. Training sessions on the use of the Volunteer Development Manual to three literacy coalitions, four local literacy programs, five libraries, and three national/statewide conferences (including eight programs in existence at the inception of the Coalition, and to one newly formed coalition)
15. Newsletter, LIT-LINK (later renamed Literacy Coalition Updates)
16. Series of memos, LINK-UP, sent to program coordinators with information on volunteer program management issues
17. Volunteer Development: Strengthening Your Literacy Program, a manual on volunteer management
18. Stories and More: Nevada History for New Readers, a collection of stories written at a new adult learner reading level
19. What Learning to Read Means To Me, essays submitted by adult learners to the Statewide Literacy Conference writing contest
20. On the Hurricane Deck of a Mule, authored by Dr. Donald Bear, a manual on the use of oral history as an instructional tool, with videotaped teaching module for rural programs
21. "Literacy in Nevada," a special eight-page supplement in the Las Vegas Sun

New Mexico

1. By April 1989, in Albuquerque: 45 adult learners recruited; 14 volunteers participating; 4 tutor trainers and 5 program staff trainers trained
2. By July 1989, in Cibola County: 27 tutors active; 87 students enrolled in LVA-Cibola County programs (60 in citizenship classes)
3. By July 1989, in Mora County: 60 adult learners recruited; 5 volunteers, 3 tutor-trainers, and 5 program staff trainers trained
4. Annual Meeting in July 1988, approximately 120 attendees
5. November 1988 through June 1990, 1,416 hotline calls
6. Resource Directory of Adult Literacy and Basic Education Programs in New Mexico, 1988 (1500 copies), developed and disseminated widely
7. Resource Directory Addendum for 1988-89 developed and disseminated widely
8. Training for 36 local literacy groups in LVA and Laubach-based tutoring systems as well as program management and related subjects
9. Eight workshop leader apprenticeships (representing 7 communities) underwritten for participation in 12 trainings at 7 sites across the state
10. Community orientation and planning meetings and seminars at 30 site-presentations and grant consultations for 40 literacy-related organizations
11. Awarding of instructional materials grants to 23 organizations
12. Statewide literacy conference, "Working Common Ground," in March 1990, approximately 250 literacy volunteers and professionals attending
13. Participation in two other statewide conferences
14. Local TV and radio interviews, press releases, statewide newsletter, PSAs, and speaking engagements by staff
15. "Reading in New Mexico 1990" art poster
16. September 1990 declared National Literacy Day in New Mexico
17. As result of Coalition PSA, 116 calls received by the hotline in September 1990
18. Three-year plan for future activities, July 1990
19. Final Report, Hispanic Literacy Program, Family Learning Center
20. Final Report, Statewide Tracking System Data Collection

21. New Mexico Adult Literacy Services Survey Results 1990-Data Collection Report
22. Establishment of the Literacy Resource Center
23. More than 35 communities served by the Literacy Resource Center, receiving training and technical materials, duplication services and networking activities

New York

1. 13 regional caucuses convened in the 10 economic development regions of the state, with 3 regions holding 2 caucuses each
2. Approximately 1,000 participants in the caucuses, including about 600 students and 400 practitioners (teachers, tutors, and program managers)
3. Student-based set of recommendations for future activities
4. Practitioner-based set of recommendations for future activities
5. State Literacy Convention, with approximately 200 participants, including 40 regional delegates and 10 caucus leaders
6. 20 student- and practitioner-supported resolutions
7. Mini-grant competition for student presentations at an annual SED conference, with 8 subsequent winners
8. Publication and distribution of a 15-page booklet entitled Learners Take Action: Ways in Which New York State Learners are Involved in their Literacy Programs
9. Videotape featuring the State Literacy Convention, produced by Albany Educational Television

Oregon

1. Directory of literacy services
2. Booklet of information on services distributed throughout state
3. 245 learner and tutor matches made between June and November 1987
4. Volunteer tutor training
5. Training Effective Literacy Tutors, instructional plans and materials
6. Summer conference, July 1987, with 75 representatives from all the recognized literacy providers in the state
7. Conference in September 1988, with 50 literacy providers in attendance
8. Combined ABE/ESL Volunteer Tutor Training Clearinghouse, computerized materials
9. Newsletter, Networks
10. Evaluation of three sample literacy programs, final report
11. One-page evaluation questionnaire, measuring the project's services
12. Year-end surveys, filled out by Task Force members
13. Oregon's Literacy Connection Tutor Training Kit
14. Coalition Planning Document, a guidebook on how to form an effective literacy coalition
15. State plan for the inclusion of literacy into the plan for community college Adult Basic Education programs
16. Fundraising for the hotline, Litline
17. Writing of a legislative bill
18. 16 local literacy coalitions formed

Pennsylvania

1. Local Coalition Building Workshop with 14 coalitions gathered, technical assistance provided, October 1987
2. Local Coalition Building Workshop, technical assistance provided, February 1989
3. 12 local coalition grant applications submitted and funded in Year 1

4. Six additional local coalitions funded in Year 2 by the "Pennsylvania Yes" fundraiser
5. Total of 23 local coalitions eventually established with start-up grants ($5,000 or less) under the Coalition
6. Local coalition activities (no systematic reporting mechanisms), including activities such as those of the Lawrence-Mercer County Coalition: business/industry breakfasts, television scripts written and produced, series of PSAs, posters created; LEARN, Inc. of York County: development of a mailing list, publicizing through media, basic brochure developed and distributed, public awareness breakfast attended by approximately 100 people at which Ellen Casey (the Governor's wife) spoke; and Project CLASS of Central Susquehanna: coalition established, industry survey conducted, brochure on services distributed.
7. Hotline developed, but eventually discontinued for lack of use
8. Updated existing Directory of Local Literacy Organizations, including providers currently serving or willing to serve in the workplace
9. Coalition newsletter inserts, as well as special project newsletter inserts disseminated through local coalitions and Governing Board members' networking
10. Computerized resource file developed with approximately 250 names, accessible by mail or by telephone (no record of use by local coalitions)
11. Technical assistance activities to local providers (records not kept)
12. Workplace Literacy Technical Assistance Program ("WorkTAP"), a cadre of individuals well trained and experienced in workplace education, providing technical assistance workshops for local coalitions
13. Upgrading Basic Skills for the Workplace, a step-by-step approach to developing, marketing, and implementing workplace literacy programs (also funded by the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce)
14. A Literate Workforce: Meeting the Needs, an accompanying videotape (also funded by the Appalachian Regional Commission and the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce)
15. Eight local coalitions funded to cover costs of WorkTAP workshop training plus 12 days of WorkTAP consultation
16. "Pennsylvania Yes!" fundraiser held by Governor and Mrs. Casey to benefit the Coalition in December 1988, raised over $30,000
17. Coalition selected again by Governor and Mrs. Casey to be the recipients of funds from "Pennsylvania, Yes! '89"
18. 20-, 30-, and 60-second television PSAs produced with Ellen Casey, made available to local television stations
19. One radio PSA and one newspaper article on literacy made available in each of the local areas once local coalitions were formed

Puerto Rico

1. 664 adult learners received reading assistance and instruction in Year 1; 47% developed reading skills equivalent to two levels or more according to post-tests, and 53% developed reading skills equivalent to one level or less
2. 373 adult learners received reading assistance and instruction in Year 2
3. In Arecibo region, 381 volunteer tutors recruited and trained
4. In Caguas region, 128 volunteer tutors recruited and trained
5. Spanish/English project descriptive booklet, and associated project materials

Rhode Island

1. Three companies worked with the project in piloting the tele-instructional process for their employees, one time each

2. Five tele-instruction sites in housing projects established
3. 83 individuals received instruction through the project
4. ACTION-VISTA Literacy Corps grant awarded to support the project for one year after the conclusion of the Gannett Foundation was awarded
5. Four learning circles formed in public housing, working at the ABE level; another three groups worked on high school equivalency materials
6. The Rhode Island Adult Academy used the teleconferencing bridge to provide support and advice to volunteer tutors; materials developed by USA TODAY were integrated into the program
7. Individual modules for all major units of the ABE Program completed

Tennessee

1. Literacy clearinghouse for public awareness and literacy promotion, student and tutor referrals, and improved communication among literacy coordinators throughout the state
2. Survey of literacy providers
3. Directory of information for networking and referral
4. TLC Newsletter
5. Long-range plan for literacy efforts in Tennessee
6. Three train-the-trainer workshops, approximately 66 attendees
7. Two mobile training teams in west Tennessee; one in the middle of the state; and two in the east
8. 15 trainers involved with the mobile teams
9. Approximately 200 tutors trained
10. 270 students and 154 volunteers referred through the clearinghouse
11. Three brochures for use by local coordinators: "Literacy is for Sharing" for tutor recruitment; "Literacy is Tennessee's Future" to inform elected officials; and "Literacy is Everybody's Business" targeted to the business community
12. Print materials including poster, bookmarks
13. Series of newspaper ads for use in local papers
14. 20-minute videotape, "Break the Cycle"
15. Three 30-second PSAs
16. Three regional conferences
17. Six regional one-day workshops, attended by 215 individuals, giving intensive instruction on teaching basic literacy skills to groups of learners
18. Co-sponsorship of a video-based tutor workshop, drawing 38 participants
19. Two $500 awards to businesses setting up workplace literacy pilot projects
20. Approximately 35 workplace literacy projects begun, with about 1,050 employees involved
21. Publicly funded literacy programs increased from 45 part-time to 72, all full-time
22. Privately funded literacy programs increased from 12 to 15
23. In-state programs started since the first grant, 1,529 learners and 1,982 tutors; in private programs, 87 learners and 85 tutors
24. Literacy programs expanded from serving 4,862 students in 1987 to serving 7,469 in 1989; volunteers increased from 4,104 in 1987 to 5,974 in 1989
25. Reaching and Teaching the Functionally Illiterate Adult, comprehensive literacy program implementation guidelines

Washington

1. Between September 1986 and June 1987, 2,782 Hotline calls from 1,754 prospective volunteers, 978 prospective students, and 50 others
2. In September and October 1987, 545 Hotline calls from volunteers, 340 from students, and 10 others

3. From September 1988 through March 1989, 1,790 Hotline calls from 958 potential volunteers, 881 potential students, and 51 interested employers and others
4. In March 1989, 288 Hotline calls from potential students
5. Washington State Literacy Hotline, information sheet
6. Hotline Procedures Manual, It's Never Too Late to Learn to Read, including Hotline operation and data entry procedures
7. Postcards ("It's Never Too Late to Learn to Read") sent to radio and television stations; probation and parole offices statewide; and public defender offices
8. Two mailings of Hotline cards to all (75,000) public assistance check recipients
9. PSA advertising the Hotline and PLUS "Adult Learner of the Month" spots installed in selected community service waiting rooms, in English and Spanish
10. Literacy Resources Directory, 1988 and 1989 (1989 printing assisted by the Department of Corrections), distributed to approximately 350 literacy programs, libraries, and interested others
11. Hotline cards distributed to 200 agencies serving Spanish-speaking clients
12. Referral system evaluation survey
13. Aid in writing and distributing two locally produced, student-oriented PSAs featuring actress Shelley Long
14. Business and Literacy Survey
15. Labor-oriented workforce primer brochure, Workforce Literacy: The Role of Organized Labor, sent to the State Labor Council mailing list of 2,000
16. Two training groups of service providers addressed on the Family Independence Program
17. Co-sponsorship of local participation in a national workplace literacy audioconference, "Workplace Literacy: Designing Effective Local Partnerships"
18. Provision of technical assistance to more than 20 local literacy programs through site visits; more aided through telephone and mail communication
19. Regional Roundtables held in three sites, approximately 60 attendees
20. "Literacy for a More Productive Workforce" conference held in November 1987; approximately 94 attendees
21. National Issues Forum Literacy Program workshop, presented with the Pierce County Literacy Coalition in October 1988
22. Business and Literacy Project Resource List, annotated bibliography listing materials in the resource library

The Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge Grants Program 1987-1990

STATE-BY-STATE PRODUCTS LIST

Submitted to The Freedom Forum by:
Welfare Research, Inc. (WRI)
112 State Street
Albany, New York 12207

Virginia Hayes Sibbison, Ph.D.
Executive Director

December 1991

© 1992 by WRI. All rights reserved.

The Freedom Forum is the new name of the Gannett Foundation.

THE FREEDOM FORUM
FREE PRESS FREE SPEECH FREE SPIRIT

The Gannett Foundation's Literacy Challenge

In 1986, the Gannett Foundation, along with USA TODAY, initiated the Literacy Challenge grants program. The goals of the program were to establish lasting mechanisms for providing literacy services, to develop innovative state-level projects to permanently expand adult literacy services, and to make adult literacy services and resources permanently available in all parts of a state. Over the course of three years (1987-1990), awards totaling nearly $2.7 million were granted to projects in 21 states.

In late 1989, the Gannett Foundation contracted with Welfare Research, Inc. (WRI), a nonprofit research organization based in Albany, New York, to document the activities, impacts, and outcomes of the Literacy Challenge grants program. Three products resulted from this contract: a compilation of 21 Individual Project Reports, an Assessment Report assessing the program as a whole and in detail, and this state-by-state Products List. These publications are available from WRI, 112 State Street, Albany, NY 12207.

The Freedom Forum is the new name of the Gannett Foundation.

Contents

Preface v
Alabama 1
Alaska 1
California 2
Connecticut 2
Delaware 2
Illinois 3
Indiana 3
Kentucky 4
Maine 4
Massachusetts 5
Minnesota 5
Mississippi 6
Nevada 6
New Mexico 7
New York 8
Oregon 8
Pennsylvania 9
Puerto Rico 9
Tennessee 10
Washington 10

Preface

The Gannett Foundation's Literacy Challenge yielded a wealth of material on adult literacy. Reflecting the intent of the Literacy Challenge grants, this material appropriately relates to specific activities associated with project goals and objectives. Much of it, however, is of potential interest to those working or studying in the field of adult literacy. Many of the products developed by individual projects can be adapted to the needs of other literacy programs. The products are presented here in the hope that the experience gained by project staff can be shared with others engaged in efforts to improve literacy among adults.

In general, most of the products developed during the grant-funded years fell into one of four categories: public awareness and recruitment; information and referral; program development and operation; and training and technical assistance. The Products List classifies the products according to their primary function in each state. For example, depending on its purpose, a brochure could be used as an informational resource or as a method for recruiting volunteers. In some cases, a product is listed under one category although at times it may also have been used for a different purpose.

The Products List presents the products developed by state in alphabetical order. As is apparent from a review of the listing, some projects produced many more materials than others. This variation is explained by the differing nature of the projects some of which required more materials to fulfill certain goals and objectives. In two states, project activities focussed on demonstration projects and did not involve the production of materials: in Connecticut, the only "product" was a final report describing the project, and in Rhode Island, there were no products apart from the tele-instructional system created to reach public housing residents and employees at the work site.

We wish to thank The Freedom Forum (formerly the Gannett Foundation) for its support of this initiative. Special appreciation is extended to Christy C. Bulkeley, Freedom Forum Vice President, whose commitment to adult literacy issues, and to this project in particular, has been unwavering.

We would also like to thank the project managers and associated board members of the 21 projects who graciously extended their cooperation during our site visits and numerous telephone conversations. One of the most enjoyable aspects of our work was the opportunity to meet this group of dedicated, unfailingly optimistic professionals.

Virginia Hayes Sibbison
Executive Director, Welfare Research, Inc.
Project Director, Gannett Foundation Literacy Challenge Project

ALABAMA

Blane K. Dessy, Director
Alabama Public Library Service
6030 Monticello Drive
Montgomery, AL 36130
(205) 277-7330

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- PSAs (10, 20, and 30 seconds) produced for radio and distributed on audiotapes to literacy programs across the state.
- Brochures for local literacy agencies.
- Brochures for statewide conferences.
- Brochure for tutor recruitment.
- Posters on adult literacy with the toll-free number.

Information and Referral

- Hotline. Funded by the State Department of Education.
- Alabama Literacy Programs Directory, published by the Alabama Illiteracy and Dropout Prevention Center of Auburn University. A looseleaf notebook format; organized by county ABE programs, city ABE programs, multi-systems ABE programs, junior college/technical school programs, and miscellaneous programs (churches, libraries, volunteer groups).
- Literacy Connection. Newsletter.

Program Development and Operation

- Material and Information for Developing a Literacy Program.
- Policy paper on literacy for the Governor's Office.
- A Proposal for a Literacy Plan for the State of Alabama. By Marilyn Centner, Director, Alabama Literacy Coalition. Draft.

ALASKA

David Alexander, President
Nine Star Enterprises
650 West International Airport Road
Anchorage, Alaska 99518
(907) 563-3174

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- PSAs for radio and television.
- Informational brochure.
- Susan Butcher recruitment poster.

Information and Referral

- Hotline.
- 1990 Directory of Programs and Services. The Alaska Adult Education Association and Nine Star Enterprises.
- Reprints of culturally sensitive materials developed by the Adult Literacy Laboratory: Level I Series, 1-5: The Jones Family; How We Live; The Seasons; In the Village; Along the River (Indian); Level II Series, 1-5: Nanalook; Nanalook's Summer; Nanalook's Stories; More Stories; Waiting (Eskimo).
- Feature in FOCUS (newsletter previously entitled Alaska's Literacy Challenge) on Gannett-funded literacy activities, particularly training of tutors and instruction of adults. The Alaska Adult Education Association with support from Nine Star Enterprises. September 1989.

Training and Technical Assistance

- Parents and Tots Reading Program materials: books for readers, an instructor's guide, and a student manual.

CALIFORNIA

Juliet Crutchfield
Adult Education Consultant
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 944272
560 J Street, Room 290
Sacramento, CA 04244-2720
(916) 322-2175

Information and Referral

- Directory of Adult Literacy Services in California: 1988-1989, Northern and Central California.
- Southern California Literacy Referral Directory: 1988-1989. Los Angeles County Public Library Foundation.

Program Development and Operation

- Improving Interagency Coordination and Referral. Final Report. Gannett Literacy Challenge Grant. SRA Associates. December 1989.

CONNECTICUT

Jane Tedder
Chief, Bureau of Adult Education
State Department of Education
25 Industrial Park Road
Middletown, CT 06457
(203) 638-4035

Program Development and Operation

- Recruiting Adult Nonreaders from the Inner City. Summary Report of the Activities of Project LINC: Literacy Improvement Needs Collaboration.

DELAWARE

Fran Tracy-Mumford
State Supervisor of Adult and
Community Education
State Department of Public Instruction
Townsend Building, P.O. Box 1402
Dover, DE 19903
(302) 739-4668

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- Informational brochure.
- Improvisational Theater Group materials.

Information and Referral

- Hotline.
- Conference materials (agendas, participants, evaluations).
- Information and Referral Handbook for literacy programs.
- Directory of Adult Services.

Program Development and Operation

- A "Literate Delaware": Challenge for the 1990's. Position Paper. March 1989.
- Gannett Literacy Challenge Grant, April 1988—May 1989: Final Report. Delaware Department of Public Instruction and the Delaware Coalition for Literacy, Inc. May 1989.
- Written Action Plan for each initiative.
- Review of collaborative programs established (workplace literacy partnerships, human service partnership).

Training and Technical Assistance

- Project BOND (intergenerational literacy program) curriculum.

ILLINOIS

Suzanne Knell, Director
Literacy-Volunteerism
Regional Office of Education
State Board of Education
200 South Fredrick Street
Rantoul, IL 61866
(617) 893-1318

Information and Referral

- Resource Development News. Newsletter.

Program Development and Operation

- Marketing Contractual Literacy Services to Business. A manual on planning, conducting a needs assessment, marketing, recruitment, and curriculum planning. Includes bibliographies, a list of resource people, and appendices.
- Increasing Individual Donations. A manual on strategies, descriptions of fundraising events, resource people, and survey results. Includes a sample survey, an annotated bibliography, and other sources of information.
- Increasing Corporate/Foundation Support. A manual on setting goals, planning, researching and identifying prospects, contacting prospective donors, writing proposals, and strategizing the future.
- Impacting Local Public Policy. A manual on raising public awareness, adult learners and public policy, and the political structure in Illinois. Includes a bibliography, a list of resources, and appendices.

INDIANA

Danny Wood, Literacy Coordinator
State Department of Education
Room 229, State House
Indianapolis, IN 46204
(317) 232-0522

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- Indiana Literacy Month Handbook. Compiled by the Public Awareness Committee to assist local coalitions and providers in their efforts for greater visibility in the community. September 1989.
- Literacy Promotional Package. Carolyn Moore and Associates.
- Radio PSAs for student recruitment.
- Radio PSAs for volunteer recruitment.

Information and Referral

- Cadre: Linking Resources With Needs. Flyer listing the six types of assistance needed for the Resource Cadre.
- Conference on Literacy Instruction. Flyer on the conference. Conference Program.
- The Literacy Letter: Report on the Conference on Literacy Instruction. Special issue of the newsletter of the Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition. Spring 1989.

Program Development and Operation

- Recommendations by the Instructional Leadership Task Force. A set of recommendations for the Indiana Adult Literacy Coalition in providing leadership for local coalitions in the area of effective instruction.
- An Evaluation of Adult Literacy Efforts in Indiana. Deborah G. Bonnet and Teresa Elston of D. Bonnet Associates. April 1988.
- Indiana Adult Literacy Clearinghouse Survey: Resource Cadre. A questionnaire for individuals volunteering to be part of the Resource Cadre.

KENTUCKY

Audrey Tayse, Executive Director
Kentucky Literacy Commission
1100 U.S. 127 South
Building A, Suite 1
Frankfort, KY 40601
(502) 564-4062

Program Development and Operation

- Report of Technical Assistance Visits/Activities. Booklet developed to track Technical Assistance Group activities conducted for local literacy programs.

Training and Technical Assistance

- Gannett Tutor-Training Resource Manual. Dr. Ruthann Phillips, Office of Adult and Community Education, Kentucky Department of Education. A 200-page looseleaf binder composed of abstracts of selected research relevant to literacy instruction and tutor training.
- Teach an Adult to Read. Series of three 30-minute videotapes designed for tutor training in "Math," "English as a Second Language," and "Learning Disabilities." KET, The Kentucky Network.
- Teach an Adult to Read. Tutor training workbook supplement to the videotape series. KET, The Kentucky Network.
- Making Literacy Work. Series of three 30-minute videotapes for local literacy programs on ""Fundraising, "Evaluation," and "Recruitment and Retention." KET, The Kentucky Network.
- Making Literacy Work. Manual accompanying the videotape series. KET, The Kentucky Network.

MAINE

David McCullough, Director
Division of Adult and
Community Education
Department of Educational and
Cultural Services
State House Station 23
Augusta, ME 04333
(207) 289-5854

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- PSAs for radio and TV.
- Student Recruitment Calendar. An "information kit."
- Student Recruitment Handbook for Literacy Providers.
- Literacy...It Pays! Business Involvement in Literacy Programs. Brochure.
- Your PERSONAL Invitation to meet the Literacy Challenge. Membership brochure.
- Media...Spreading the Word. Handbook to assist literacy providers in their public awareness activities and use of media services.
- Workbook for Voter Education Project to increase the number of adult new readers who register to vote.
- Maine Literacy Awareness Theater. Improvisational Theater scenarios.

Information and Referral

- Hotline.
- Brochure on "Reflections," a reading and discussion series for adult new readers.
- Bibliography of low-level, high-interest resources for adult new readers.
- List of businesses supporting Project Impact, the North Berwick School Administrative District (SAD) 60 campaign.

Training and Technical Assistance

- A Guide to Adult New Reader Humanities-Based Reading Programs in Public Libraries. Based on "Reflections."
- Adult Literacy Handbook for Libraries and Librarians.
- Workforce Literacy Handbook. Handbook to assist literacy providers in developing outreach presentations to the business or social services community.

MASSACHUSETTS

Ruth Derfler, Chair
Massachusetts Coalition for Adult Literacy
P.O. Box 547
Boston, MA 02102
(617) 536-1161

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- PSAs.
- Six news/feature spots for television and radio.
- Print materials: billboards, bookmarks, grocery bags, newspaper public service ads, bumper stickers, buttons, and ads on public transportation systems.
- Literacy Day materials.
- Some of Us Take A Lot for Granted. Membership brochure.

Information and Referral

- Hotline.
- Computerized database of public and private adult literacy programs.
- Directory of services.
- MCAL News. Bi-monthly newsletter, focused on funding and related policy issues.
- "Meet and Greet" materials for literacy providers reaching out to legislative representatives.
- MCAL Bulletin. Legislative bulletin giving background and status of legislation and lists of legislators. Published as needed.

Program Development and Operation

- Guidelines and strategies for a comprehensive volunteer program with program models, job descriptions, types of training, types of placements, and types of supervision.
- Massachusetts Coalition for Adult Literacy: Descriptions of Board Committees: Executive, Public Policy, Public Relations, Membership, and Business/Labor.
- Job descriptions for Board members, staff, volunteers, and interns.

Training and Technical Assistance

- Curriculum for Tax Teach-In.

MINNESOTA

Peter D. Pearson, Executive Director
Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign
475 North Cleveland Avenue
Suite 210
St. Paul, MN 55104
(612) 644-9978

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- Posters and tearpads on the Basic Skills Hotline.
- PSAs for radio and television.
- A Guide to Marketing and Publicizing Adult Literacy Programs. Patricia Carlson. Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign. October 1989.

Information and Referral

- Hotline.
- Connections. Newsletter.
- Adult Literacy in Minnesota: Questions and Answers. Brochure.
- Monograph of Minnesota Literacy Programs Using Technology.

Program Development and Operation

- The Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign: Evaluation Report. Stacey Hueftle Stockdill. En Search. September 1988 and July 1989.
- Statewide Needs Assessment of Literacy Services. Conducted by the Wilder Foundation for the Minnesota Adult Literacy Campaign.

Training and Technical Assistance

- Step By Step Curriculum Guides. Learning Disabilities Association.

MISSISSIPPI

Eloise Johnson
Director of Adult Education
State Department of Education
P.O. Box 771
Jackson, MS 39205
(601) 359-3467

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- Three 30-second PSAs for television. Received the Jim Duffy Award.
- Print materials on the Hotline: welfare and unemployment check inserts, posters, flyers, grocery bags.
- Information displays on the Hotline in public offices.

Information and Referral

- Hotline.
- "Building the Future: Mississippi's Challenge of Adult Literacy." Governor's Third Annual Statewide Adult Literacy Conference, November 10, 1988. Flyer and conference agenda.
- Directory of Mississippi Literacy Programs. November 1989.

Program Development and Operation

- Mississippi Literacy Coalition: Recommended Hotline Procedures. Communications Committee, Larry L. Johnson, Chairman. August 18, 1988.
- Evaluation Report on the Tutor Intervention Model Program. William M. Hetrick and Thomas Cosby, Center for Community Education, University of Southern Mississippi. March 1989.
- The Degree and Distribution of Functional Illiteracy in Mississippi as Determined by the Use of the Simplified or Oral Driver License Examination. Report on needs assessment. William Hetrick, University of Southern Mississippi. March 1989.
- Written recommendation to establish a Governor's Office for Literacy.

Training and Technical Assistance

- Handbook for Tutor Intervention Model Program. Eloise Johnson, Bureau of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, Mississippi State Department of Education. 1988.
- Tutor Intervention Model Program. Eloise Johnson, Bureau of Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, Mississippi State Department of Education. 1989.

NEVADA

Bonnie J. Buckley, Library Consultant
State Library and Archives
Capitol Complex, 401 North Carson
Carson City, NV 89710
(702) 887-2623

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- PSAs for radio and television.
- Print materials for newspapers statewide.
- "Literacy in Nevada." Special eight-page supplement in the Las Vegas Sun.
- Inserts for government welfare and unemployment checks.
- Information displays at public offices.

Information and Referral

- Hotline.
- Single statewide literacy information and referral network.
- Nevada Literacy Directory.
- Lit-Link. Newsletter of the Nevada Literacy Coalition. 1987-89.
- Literacy Coalition Updates. Newsletter of the Nevada Literacy Coalition. 1990-present.
- Stories and More: Nevada History for New Readers, Volumes 1-2. Edited by Phillip Earl, Curator of History for the Nevada Historical Society. November 1989.
- "Link to Literacy—Link to Life." Statewide Literacy Conference, February 1988. Conference materials.
- Resource guides.
- Bibliography of recommended reading materials.

Program Development and Operation

- Project TACL: A Team Approach to Community Literacy. Report on statewide literacy needs assessment. Donald R. Bear, Cliff Ferry, and Shane Templeton, Center for Learning and Literacy, College of Education, University of Nevada-Reno.

- Literacy Activity Reporting System (LARS). A coordinated system of accountability for gathering and disseminating information.
- Statewide Literacy Needs Assessment.
- "Link-UP." Series of memos on volunteer management system, providing data on volunteer involvement in literacy programs statewide.

Training and Technical Assistance

- Volunteer Development: Strengthening Your Literacy Program. Manual.
- On the Hurricane Deck of a Mule. Manual on the use of oral history as an instructional technique. Donald R. Bear, University of Nevada.
- "Learn to Read" Series. A series of 30 reading lessons on KNPB-Channel 5 (Public Broadcasting Station): 2 lessons offered each Saturday for 15 weeks.
- Training curricula with tutoring materials, information packets, and materials on interviewing techniques.
- Workshop material on recruiting students, testing, and confidentiality.
- Training video productions on diagnostic principles and techniques; language experience; work study and phonics; and planning an hour of instruction. University of Nevada.

NEW MEXICO

Susie Sonflieth, Executive Director
New Mexico Coalition for Literacy
P.O. Box 6085
Santa Fe, New Mexico 87502-6085
(505) 982-3997

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- PSAs for radio and televison.
- "Reading in New Mexico 1990." Art Poster.

Information and Referral

- Hotline.
- Resource Directory of Adult Literacy and Basic Education Programs in New Mexico, 1988. Resource Directory Addendum for 1988-1989.
- "Working Common Ground." Statewide Literacy Conference, March 13-16, 1990. Conference materials.

Program Development and Operation

- Impact Reports. Forms for collecting impact information associated with system capacity/size, system permanence, and system quality and effectiveness improvements.
- Hispanic Literacy Program, Family Learning Center. Final Report submitted by SER de Albuquerque Family Learning Center Project. April 1989.
- Statewide Tracking System Data Collection. Final Report. Prepared by Leslie Rich and the NMCL for the New Mexico Department of Labor.
- New Mexico Adult Literacy Services Survey Results 1990. November 1990. Survey of literacy programs throughout the state to receive recommendations for conference workshops, topics, speakers, and instructors, and to learn the areas of greatest need.
- New Mexico Adult Literacy Services Survey Results 1990. Data Collection Report. November 1990.

NEW YORK

Garrett Murphy, Director
Division of Adult and Continuing Education
State Education Department
Cultural Education Center, 5D28
Albany, NY 12230
(518) 474-8703

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- Brochures on regional caucuses.
- Brochures on statewide convention.

Information and Referral

- New York State Literacy Convention, February 13-14, 1989. Agenda and other materials.
- Videotape featuring the state literacy convention. Produced by Albany Educational Television.
- Learners Take Action! Ways in which New York State Learners are Involved in their Literacy Programs. 17-page booklet describing the regional caucuses and the state convention and listing the resolutions/recommendations of the learners and the practitioners.

OREGON

Sharlene Walker
Office of Community College Services
State Department of Education
700 Pringle Parkway
Salem, OR 97310
(503) 378-4156

Information and Referral

- Hotline.

Training and Technical Assistance

- Oregon's Literacy Connection Tutor Training Kit. Self-paced training manual in looseleaf notebook format with specific instructions and tips for training tutors.
- Training Effective Literacy Tutors. Instructional Plans and Materials. By Geraldine Pearson and Virginia Patton. Distributed by Office of Community College Services, State of Oregon.

Program Development and Operation

- Oregon's Literacy Connection Project Evaluation: First Year Formative Evaluation Summary. By Karen Reed Green, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Learner Progress in Three Sample Programs: Preliminary Findings. By Karen Reed Green, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory.
- Coalition Planning Document. A guide with sections on forming and maintaining local coalitions, conducting a community needs assessment, a bibliography, and appendices.
- Learner Progress in Three Volunteer Literacy Tutor Programs: Final Report. By Karen Reed Wilkelund, Northwest Regional Educational Laboratory. June 1989.

PENNSYLVANIA

Dr. Eunice N. Askov, Director
Institute for the Study of Adult Literacy
Penn State University
College of Education
204 Calder Way, Suite 209
University Park, PA 16801
(814) 863-3777

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- PSAs for radio and television.
- Pennsylvania State Coalition for Adult Literacy. Brochure.
- WorkTAP: Workplace Technical Assistance Program. Brochure.

Information and Referral

- Computerized Resource Bank.
- Directory of Local Literacy Organizations.

Training and Technical Assistance

- Upgrading Basic Skills for the Workplace (a training manual) and A Literate Workforce: Meeting the Needs (a videotape). Workplace literacy materials funded by the Gannett Foundation, the Appalachian Regional Commission, and the Pennsylvania Department of Commerce.

Program Development and Operation

- Blue Ribbon Advisory Board.

PUERTO RICO

Ana Victoria Leon, Director
Literacy Program
Educational Extension Area
Department of Education
P.O. Box 759
Hato Rey, PR 00191
(809) 754-0935

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- The Literacy Program for Puerto Rico. Booklet in Spanish and English.
- Informational brochures requesting community involvement.
- Coupons to recruit volunteers and students.
- Posters publicizing the project.

Information and Referral

- Listing of the qualities of a good tutor.
- Listing of the roles of the teacher-coordinator.
- A set of 100 slides illustrating tutors delivering services.
- Videotapes showing the project's literacy activities.
- A set of graphs illustrating percentages of illiteracy in each municipality of the Island.

Program Development and Operation

- Data collection forms for tutor activity and student progress.
- Photo albums documenting the development of the project at the different sites.

TENNESSEE

Jeannie Bellephant
Community Education Coordinator
Office of Adult and
Community Education
State Department of Education
Cordell Hull Building
Nashville, TN 37219
(615) 741-7054

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- Three PSAs.
- Poster with Hotline number.
- Bookmarks with Hotline number.
- Literacy is Tennessee's Future. Literacy is For Sharing. Literacy is Everybody's Business. Brochures.
- Tennessee Literacy Challenge Conferences, March 4-5, 1988 and March 18-19, 1988. Brochures.
- Bringing the Pieces Together. Membership Brochure for the Tennessee Literacy Coalition.

Information and Referral

- Hotline.
- Literacy clearinghouse for public awareness and literacy promotion, student and tutor referrals, and improved communication among literacy coordinators throughout the state.
- Directory of information for networking and referral.
- "Break the Cycle." 20-minute videotape. Funded partially by the Gannett Foundation and South Central Bell.
- Newsletter.

Program Development and Operation

- Survey of literacy providers. Questionnaire.
- Reaching and Teaching the Functionally Illiterate Adult. Comprehensive literacy program implementation guidelines developed by Dr. Ken McCullough, University of Tennessee. A 200-page 3-ring binder. With the Gannett Foundation grant, the Tennessee Literacy Coalition duplicated the material, produced new binders, and disseminated the products to literacy programs.
- Long-range plan for literacy efforts in Tennessee.

WASHINGTON

Christine Cassidy, Executive Director
Washington Literacy
1100 Denny Way
Seattle, Washington 98109
(206) 461-3623

Public Awareness and Recruitment

- Washington State Literacy Hotline postcards.
- Washington State Literacy Hotline (800) 323-2550. Information sheet.
- Factsheet on Illiteracy. Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy. October 1987.
- WACAL - Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy. One-page description of goals, membership, and accomplishments.
- Scripts for PSAs in English and Spanish.
- Workforce Literacy: The Role of Organized Labor. Brochure. The Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy and the Washington State Labor Council.

Information and Referral

- Hotline.
- Literacy Resources Directory, Washington State 1989.
- Workplace Literacy Reading List. One-page list of key publications.
- "Literacy for a More Productive Workforce" Conference Agenda.
- Business and Literacy Project Resource List. Annotated bibliography listing materials in the Washington Coalition for Adult Literacy's Business and Literacy Project resource library. August 1988.

Program Development and Operation

- Washington State Literacy Hotline Program Description/Agreement.
- It's Never Too Late to Learn to Read. Literacy Hotline Procedures Manual.
- Business and Literacy Survey. Questionnaire.

The Freedom Forum
1101 Wilson Boulevard
Arlington, Virginia 22209
(703) 528-0800

Welfare Research, Inc.
112 State Street
Albany, New York 12207
(518) 432-2576